arXiv:1612.08783v1 [math.NT] 28 Dec 2016

Irrationality of special values of formal Laurent series represented by the formal Mellin transform of G-functions

Makoto Kawashima

Contents

1 Introduction **1**

2 Preliminaries **4**

2.1 Estimation of the lower bound of the vector space spanned by some p-adic numbers over an algebraic number field 4

2.2 Formal Mellin transform 5

2.2.1 Relation between formal Mellin transform and p-adic Stieltjes transform 8

3 Padé approximation of formal Laurent series **10**

4 Some estimations **12**

5 Non-vanishing of determinant **17**

6 Proof of Theorem 1.2 **21**

7 Some example of Theorem 1.2 **23**

*

Abstract

Let p be a prime number and $\mathbb{C}_p$ the completion of algebraic closure of $\mathbb{Q}_p$. Let K be an algebraic number field. We fix an embedding $\iota_p : \overline{\mathbb{Q}} \hookrightarrow \mathbb{C}_p$ and denote K_p the completion of K with respect to the embedding ι_p. Let $g(z) \in K[[z]]$ and denote by $\mathcal{M}(g)(z) \in \frac{1}{z}K\left[\left[\frac{1}{z}\right]\right]$ the formal Mellin transform of $g(z)$ (see Definition 2.2). In this article, we prove that if $\mathcal{M}(g)(z))$ has a good Padé approximation, the special values $\mathcal{M}(g)(\alpha)$ are convergent in K_p and irrational for infinitely many $\alpha \in \mathbb{Q} \cap (\mathbb{Q}_p \setminus \mathbb{Z}_p)$ satisfying certain conditions. (see Theorem 1.2 for the precise statement). This result can be regarded as a partial generalization of the method of Beukers [6] in his proof the irrationality of special values of p-adic Hurwitz zeta functions (cf. [6, Theorem 9.2]).

1 Introduction

Let $\overline{\mathbb{Q}}$ be an algebraic closure of the rational number field. There exist a lot of research on the Padé approximation of formal Laurent series (resp. formal power series) with algebraic coefficients (cf. [11],[12],[13],[14]). There also exist a lot of research on the irrationality of the special values of formal

* *Key words and phrases.* Padé approximation, irrationality, special values of formal Laurent series.

Laurent series (resp. formal power series) with algebraic coefficients by using the Padé approximation of them (cf. [11],[12],[13],[14]).

In this article, we give a general method to prove the irrationality of the special values of a certain formal Laurent series with coefficients $\mathbb{Q}$. We introduce the formal Mellin transform $\mathcal{M}$ as follows:

$$\mathcal{M} : \overline{\mathbb{Q}}[[z]] \longrightarrow \tfrac{1}{z}\overline{\mathbb{Q}}\left[\left[\tfrac{1}{z}\right]\right], \ g(z) \mapsto \mathcal{M}(g) := \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} b_k \left(\frac{-1}{z}\right)^{k+1},$$

where $\{b_k\}_{k\in\mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}}$ are defined by $g(e^z-1) = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} b_k \frac{z^k}{k!}$.

Traditionally, the irrationality for the special values of formal Laurent series with good Padé approximation was known as a standard method. The new point of this work is a use of the formal Mellin transform $\mathcal{M}$. We consider the irrationality for the formal Laurent series $f(z) = \mathcal{M}(g)(z)$ which are obtained as the image of $\mathcal{M}$ of a formal power series $g(z)$ with good convergence.

The definition of formal Mellin transform was inspired by the work of Beukers [6] mentioned in Abstract. In fact, we have the following equality:

$$\mathcal{M}\left(\frac{\log(1+z)}{z}\right) = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} B_k \left(\frac{-1}{z}\right)^{k+1}, \tag{1}$$

where $\{B_k\}_{k\in\mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}}$ are defined by $\dfrac{z}{e^z-1} = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} B_k \frac{z^k}{k!}$. The right hand side (resp. the left hand side) of (1) is a prototype of $f(z)$ (resp. $\mathcal{M}(g)(z)$) explained above. Also the equality (1) played an important role for the irrationality of certain special values of the right hand side of (1) in the proof of [6, Theorem 9.2] .

Using the formal Mellin transform, we obtain the following results of the Padé approximation of formal Laurent series. Let m be a natural number. We fix m-formal power series

$$g_1(z) = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} a_{1,k} z^k, \ldots, g_m(z) = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} a_{m,k} z^k \in \overline{\mathbb{Q}}[[z]],$$

and denote

$$f_1 := \mathcal{M}(g_1), \ldots, f_m := \mathcal{M}(g_m) \in \tfrac{1}{z}\overline{\mathbb{Q}}\left[\left[\tfrac{1}{z}\right]\right].$$

About the Padé approximation of $(f_1, \ldots, f_m)$, we have the following theorem.

THEOREM 1.1. *Let $f_1 := \mathcal{M}(g_1), \ldots, f_m := \mathcal{M}(g_m) \in \frac{1}{z}\overline{\mathbb{Q}}\left[\left[\frac{1}{z}\right]\right]$ as above. Let $\mathbf{n} := (n_1, \ldots, n_m) \in \mathbb{N}^m$ and*

$$P_v^{(\mathbf{n})}(z) = \sum_{j=0}^{n_v} p_{v,j}^{(\mathbf{n})} \frac{z(z+1)\ldots(z+j-1)}{j!} \text{ for } 1 \leq v \leq m,$$

be polynomials with coefficients $\overline{\mathbb{Q}}$. Then, the following are equivalent.

(i) *There exists $P_0^{(\mathbf{n})}(z) \in \overline{\mathbb{Q}}[z]$ satisfying $(P_0^{(\mathbf{n})}(z), P_1^{(\mathbf{n})}(z), \ldots, P_m^{(\mathbf{n})}(z))$ is a $\mathbf{n}$-th Padé approximation of $(f_1, \ldots, f_m)$.*[*]

[*] See Definition 3.2 for the definition of $\mathbf{n}$-th Padé approximation of $(f_1, \ldots, f_m)$.

(ii) *We have the following linear relations among* $\{p_{v,j}^{(\mathbf{n})}\}_{1\leq v\leq m, 1\leq j\leq n_v}$*:*

$$\sum_{v=1}^{m}\sum_{j=0}^{n_v}\left((-1)^j\sum_{l=0}^{k}\binom{j}{l}\binom{k+j-l}{j}a_{v,k+j-l}\right)p_{v,j}^{(\mathbf{n})}=0 \text{ for } 0\leq k\leq\sum_{v=1}^{m}(n_v+1)-2, \tag{2}$$

where we denote $\binom{j}{l}=0$ *if* l,j *satisfy* $l>j$*.*

Furthermore, if $(P_0^{(\mathbf{n})}(z),P_1^{(\mathbf{n})}(z),\ldots,P_m^{(\mathbf{n})}(z))$ *is a* $\mathbf{n}$*-th Padé approximation of* $(f_1,\ldots,f_m)$*, then we have the following relations:*

$$P_0^{(\mathbf{n})}(z)=-\sum_{v=1}^{m}\sum_{j=1}^{n_v}p_{v,j}^{(\mathbf{n})}\left(\frac{z(z+1)\ldots(z+j-1)}{j!}\right)\left(\sum_{k=0}^{j-1}\frac{(-1)^k a_{v,k}k!}{z(z+1)\ldots(z+k)}\right), \tag{3}$$

$$\mathcal{R}^{(\mathbf{n})}(z)=\sum_{k=\sum_{v=1}^{m}(n_v+1)-1}^{\infty}\left(\sum_{v=1}^{m}\sum_{j=0}^{n_v}(-1)^j p_{v,j}^{(\mathbf{n})}\sum_{l=0}^{k}\binom{j}{l}\binom{k+j-l}{j}a_{v,k+j-l}\right)\frac{(-1)^{k+1}k!}{z(z+1)\ldots(z+k)}. \tag{4}$$

□

We give the proof of Theorem 1.1 in section 3.

Let p be a prime number. We denote $\mathbb{C}_p$ be the p-adic completion of the algebraic closure of $\mathbb{Q}_p$. We denote the normalized valuation of $\mathbb{C}_p$ by

$$|\cdot|_p:\mathbb{C}_p\longrightarrow\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0},\quad |p|_p=p^{-1}.$$

We fix an embedding $\iota_p:\overline{\mathbb{Q}}\hookrightarrow\mathbb{C}_p$. Using Theorem 1.1, we obtain the irrationality of special values of certain formal Laurent series with rational coefficients in the p-adic field. To state the results, we prepare some notations. We define the denominator function as follows:

$$\mathrm{den}:\bigsqcup_{n\in\mathbb{N}}\overline{\mathbb{Q}}^n\longrightarrow\mathbb{N},\ (\alpha_1,\ldots,\alpha_n)\mapsto\min\{n\in\mathbb{N}|\ n\alpha_i \text{ are algebraic integer for all } 1\leq i\leq n\}.$$

We also define the house function as follows:

$$\overline{|\cdot|}:\overline{\mathbb{Q}}\longrightarrow\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0},\ \alpha\mapsto\max_{\sigma\in Hom(\overline{\mathbb{Q}},\mathbb{C})}|\sigma(\alpha)|.$$

Let K be an algebraic number field and $g(z)=\sum_{k=0}^{\infty}a_k z^k\in K[[z]]$. We denote the completion of K with respect to the fixed embedding ι_p by K_p. For a non-negative integer $j\in\mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$, we denote $\mathrm{den}(a_k)_{0\leq k\leq j}$ by e_j. We also denote the set of elements $g(z)=\sum_{k=0}^{\infty}a_k z^k\in K[[z]]$ satisfying the following conditions:

(i) There exists $\delta>0$ and $C_1>0$ satisfying $\overline{|a_j|}\leq\delta C_1^j$ for all $j\in\mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$,

(ii) For any $\epsilon>0$, there exists $\gamma=\gamma(\epsilon)>0$ and $C_2\geq 1$ satisfying $e_j\leq\gamma C_2^{j(1+\epsilon)}$ for all $j\in\mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$,

by $\mathbf{G}(K,C_1,C_2)$. In this article, we call the elements of $\mathbf{G}(K,C_1,C_2)$ G-function. For the embedding ι_p, we denote the natural extension of it to $K[[z]]$ (resp. $K[[\frac{1}{z}]]$) by ι_p again and $\iota_p(g)$ (resp. $\iota_p(f)$) by g_p (resp. f_p) for $g\in K[[z]]$ (resp. $f\in K[[\frac{1}{z}]]$). We define the function of p-adic radius of convergence as follows:

$$r_p:K[[z]]\longrightarrow\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}\cup\{\infty\},\ \sum_{k=0}^{\infty}a_k z^k\mapsto\limsup_k(|\iota_p(a_k)|_p)^{-1}.$$

We denote the set $\{g(z)\in K[[z]]|\ r_p(g_p)\geq 1\}$ by $\mathcal{B}_{p,K}$. Under the above notations, our main results are as follows:

THEOREM 1.2. *Let p be a prime number and $g \in (\mathbf{G}(K, C_1, C_2) \cap \mathcal{B}_{p,K}) \setminus \overline{\mathbb{Q}}[\log(1+z), (1+z)^{\alpha} | \alpha \in \overline{\mathbb{Q}}]$. Put $r := r_p(g)$. For $\alpha \in \{\alpha \in \mathbb{Q} |\ |\alpha|_p > 1\}$, we have the following sufficient conditions for irrationality of $\mathcal{M}(g)_p(\alpha)$:*

(i) *Suppose*

$$C_1 > 1 \text{ and } [K_p : \mathbb{Q}_p] r p^{\frac{2}{p-1}} |\alpha|_p^2 > [K : \mathbb{Q}] 16 e (C_1 C_2)^3 \mathrm{den}(\alpha) \prod_{q | \mathrm{den}(\alpha), q:\mathrm{prime}} q^{\frac{1}{q-1}},$$

then we have $\mathcal{M}(g)_p(\alpha) \in K_p \setminus K$.

(ii) *Suppose*

$$\frac{1}{2} < C_1 \leq 1 \text{ and } [K_p : \mathbb{Q}_p] r p^{\frac{2}{p-1}} |\alpha|_p^2 > [K : \mathbb{Q}] 16 e C_1^2 C_2^3 \mathrm{den}(\alpha) \prod_{q | \mathrm{den}(\alpha), q:\mathrm{prime}} q^{\frac{1}{q-1}},$$

then we have $\mathcal{M}(g)_p(\alpha) \in K_p \setminus K$.

(iii) *Suppose*

$$C_1 \leq \frac{1}{2} \text{ and } [K_p : \mathbb{Q}_p] r p^{\frac{2}{p-1}} |\alpha|_p^2 > [K : \mathbb{Q}] 4 e C_2^3 \mathrm{den}(\alpha) \prod_{q | \mathrm{den}, \mathrm{q:prime}(\alpha)} q^{\frac{1}{q-1}},$$

then we have $\mathcal{M}(g)_p(\alpha) \in K_p \setminus K$.

□

We remark that the convergence of $\mathcal{M}(g)_p(\alpha)$ in Theorem 1.2 is mentioned in Remark 2.13. We give the proof and some examples of Theorem 1.2 in section 6 and 7 respectively.

Acknowledgement:
The author would like to thank Professor Tadashi Ochiai for his encouragement and comments on an earlier version of the manuscript.

Notations

Most of the notations are the same as that of Introduction. We regard all the algebraic number fields as the subfields of $\overline{\mathbb{Q}}$. For an algebraic number field K, we denote the ring of integers of K by $\mathcal{O}_K$.

For $a \in \mathbb{P}^1(\mathbb{C}_p)$ and $r > 0$, we define subset $D_p(a, r^-)$ of $\mathbb{P}^1(\mathbb{C}_p)$ as follows:

$$D_p(a, r^-) := \begin{cases} \{z \in \mathbb{C}_p |\ |z - a|_p < r\} & \text{if } a \in \mathbb{C}_p, \\ \{x \in \mathbb{C}_p |\ |z|_p > r^{-1}\} \cup \{\infty\} & \text{if } a = \infty. \end{cases}$$

For a natural number n, we denote the least common multiple of $1, 2, \ldots, n$ by d_n.

2 Preliminaries

2.1 Estimation of the lower bound of the vector space spanned by some p-adic numbers over an algebraic number field

In this subsection, we recall an estimation of a lower bound of the dimension of the vector space over a number field spanned by p-adic numbers. The method is originally devised by Siegel (cf. [17]). Let K be an algebraic number field and fix an embedding of K into $\mathbb{C}_p$. We denote the completion of K by the fixed embedding by K_p and the set of all embedding K into $\mathbb{C}$ by $I_K^{(\infty)}$. The following Lemma was proved by Pierre Bel in [5].

LEMMA 2.1. [5, lemma 4.1] Let m be a natural number and K an algebraic number field. Let $\theta_1, \cdots, \theta_m \in \mathbb{C}_p$. Suppose that there exists $(m+1)$-linear forms

$$L_w^{(n)}(X_0, \cdots, X_m) = \sum_{v=0}^{m} A_{v,w}^{(n)} X_v \quad (0 \leq v \leq m; n \in \mathbb{N}),$$

for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$ with coefficients $\{A_{v,w}^{(n)}\}_{0 \leq v,w \leq m} \subset \mathcal{O}_K$ satisfying the following conditions:

$$\det((A_{v,w}^{(n)})_{0 \leq v,w \leq m}) \neq 0 \text{ for infinitely many } n \in \mathbb{N}. \tag{5}$$

There exist a set of positive real numbers $\{c_\tau\}_{\tau \in I_K^{(\infty)}}$ and a positive real number ρ satisfying the following conditions:

$$\max_{0 \leq w \leq m} ||\tau L_w^{(n)}|| \leq e^{c_\tau n + o(n)} \text{ for } \tau \in I_K^{(\infty)} \text{ and } n \in \mathbb{N},$$
$$\max_{0 \leq w \leq m} |L_w^{(n)}(\boldsymbol{\theta})|_p \leq e^{-\rho n + o(n)} \text{ and } n \in \mathbb{N},$$

where $||\tau L_w^{(n)}|| = \max_{0 \leq v \leq m} |\tau A_{v,w}^{(n)}|$. Then, we have

$$\dim_K(K + K\theta_1 + \cdots + K\theta_m) \geq \frac{[K_p : \mathbb{Q}_p]\rho}{\sum_{\tau \in I_K^{(\infty)}} c_\tau}. \tag{6}$$

2.2 Formal Mellin transform

In this subsection, we introduce the formal Mellin transform. During this subsection, we denote K be a field of characteristic 0.

DEFINITION 2.2. We define the formal Mellin transform with coefficients K as follows:

$$\mathcal{M}_K : K[[z]] \longrightarrow \tfrac{1}{z}K\left[\left[\tfrac{1}{z}\right]\right],\ g(z) \mapsto \mathcal{M}_K(g) := \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} b_k \left(\frac{-1}{z}\right)^{k+1}$$

where $\{b_k\}_{k \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}}$ are defined by $g(e^z - 1) = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \frac{b_k}{k!} z^k$. If $K = \overline{\mathbb{Q}}$, for simplicity, we denote $\mathcal{M}_{\overline{\mathbb{Q}}}$ by $\mathcal{M}$.

We have the following property of formal Mellin transform.

PROPOSITION 2.3. *Let $g(z) = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} a_k z^k \in K[[z]]$. Then we have the following identities:*

$$\mathcal{M}_K(g) = -\sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \frac{(-1)^k a_k k!}{z(z+1)\dots(z+k)}. \tag{7}$$

Especially, we have the following identity:

$$\tfrac{1}{z}K\left[\left[\tfrac{1}{z}\right]\right] = \left\{ \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \frac{c_k k!}{z(z+1)\dots(z+k)} \mid c_k \in K \text{ for all } k \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0} \right\}.$$

To prove Proposition 2.3, we introduce formal Laplace transform.

Definition 2.4. (cf. [7] p.154)
We define the following K-linear isomorphism $\mathcal{L}_K : K[[z]] \longrightarrow K[[z]]$ by

$$\mathcal{L}_K\left(\sum_{k=0}^{\infty} a_k \frac{z^k}{k!}\right) = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} a_k z^k.$$

We call $\mathcal{L}_K$ the formal Laplace transform. Endowing $K[[z]]$ with the (z)-adic topology, we see that the formal Laplace transform is a homeomorphism.

Lemma 2.5. *Let $m \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$. We have the following identity in $K[[z]]$:*

$$\mathcal{L}_K\left(\frac{(e^z-1)^m}{m!}\right) = \frac{z^m}{(1-z)\cdots(1-mz)}.$$

Proof. For $(n,m) \in (\mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0})^2$, we define the (n,m)-th Stirling number of the second kind $a_{n,m}$ which satisfies the following recurrence relations. The initial values $a_{0,0}, a_{n,0}, a_{0,m}$ satisfy:

$$a_{0,0} = 1 \text{ and } a_{n,0} = a_{0,m} = 0 \text{ for } (n,m) \neq (0,0) \tag{8}$$

and the value $a_{n,m}$ satisfies the recurrence relation

$$a_{n,m} = a_{n-1,m-1} + m a_{n-1,m} \text{ for } n, m \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 1}. \tag{9}$$

For $m \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$, we define two sequences of rational numbers $\{b_{k,m}\}_{k\in\mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}}$ and $\{c_{k,m}\}_{k\in\mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}}$ which satisfy the following relations respectively.

$$\frac{(e^z-1)^m}{m!} = \sum_{k=m}^{\infty} b_{k,m}\frac{z^k}{k!}, \ \frac{z^m}{(1-z)\cdots(1-mz)} = \sum_{k=m}^{\infty} c_{k,m} z^k. \tag{10}$$

It is easy to show that $\{b_{k,m}\}_{k\in\mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}}$ and $\{c_{k,m}\}_{k\in\mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}}$ satisfy the recurrence relations (8) and (9). Namely, $a_{k,m} = b_{k,m} = c_{k,m}$ for all $(k,m) \in (\mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0})^2$. Applying the formal Laplace transform for $\frac{(e^z-1)^m}{m!}$, we obtain Lemma 2.5. □

[Proof of Proposition 2.3]
We define the following map:

$$\Psi_K : K[[z]] \longrightarrow \tfrac{1}{z}K\left[\left[\tfrac{1}{z}\right]\right], \ \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} b_k z^k \mapsto \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} b_k \left(\frac{-1}{z}\right)^{k+1}.$$

From the definition of $\mathcal{M}_K, \mathcal{L}_K$ and Ψ_K, we have the equality:

$$\mathcal{M}_K = \Psi_K \circ \mathcal{L}_K \circ (z \mapsto e^z - 1). \tag{11}$$

The equality (7) is easily proved by using Lemma 2.5 and the equality (11). Since $\mathcal{M}_K$ is surjective, we obtain the second condition of Proposition 2.3. □

Definition 2.6. We denote the isomorphism of K-algebra $\mathcal{M}_K^{\mathrm{ope}}$ as follows:

$$\mathcal{M}_K^{\mathrm{ope}} : K[[z]] \longrightarrow K\left[\left[\tfrac{d}{dz}\right]\right], \ \mathcal{M}_K^{\mathrm{ope}}(z) := \exp(\tfrac{d}{dz}) - 1.$$

We denote $\exp(\frac{d}{dz})$ by Δ.

We define the action $K\left[\left[\frac{d}{dz}\right]\right] \times \frac{1}{z}K\left[\left[\frac{1}{z}\right]\right] \longrightarrow \frac{1}{z}K\left[\left[\frac{1}{z}\right]\right]$ by

$$\left(\sum_{k=0}^{\infty} a_k \left(\frac{d}{dz}\right)^k, \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} b_k \left(\frac{-1}{z}\right)^{k+1}\right) \mapsto \sum_{k=0}^{\infty}\left[\sum_{l=0}^{k} l! a_l \binom{k}{k-l} b_{k-l}\right]\left(\frac{-1}{z}\right)^{k+1}. \tag{12}$$

Note that the action of $\Delta \in K\left[\left[\frac{d}{dz}\right]\right]$ for $f(z) \in \frac{1}{z}K\left[\left[\frac{1}{z}\right]\right]$ can be written explicitly as follows:

$$\Delta(f(z)) = f(z+1).$$

Proposition 2.7. *We have the following commutative diagram:*

$$\begin{array}{ccc} K[[z]] \times K[[z]] & \xrightarrow{\mathcal{M}_K^{\mathrm{ope}} \times \mathcal{M}_K} & K\left[\left[\frac{d}{dz}\right]\right] \times \frac{1}{z}K\left[\left[\frac{1}{z}\right]\right] \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ K[[z]] & \xrightarrow{\mathcal{M}_K} & \frac{1}{z}K\left[\left[\frac{1}{z}\right]\right] \end{array},$$

where the first vertical morphism is defined by product and the second one is by (12).

Proof. It is enough to show $\mathcal{M}_K^{\mathrm{ope}}(z)\mathcal{M}_K(g) = \mathcal{M}_K(zg)$ for any $g \in K[[z]]$. Let $g(z) = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} a_k z^k \in K[[z]]$. Firstly, we calculate $\mathcal{M}_K(zg)$. From Proposition 2.3, we have

$$\mathcal{M}_K(zg) = -\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \frac{(-1)^k a_{k-1} z^k}{z(z+1)\dots(z+k)}. \tag{13}$$

On the other hand, for $\mathcal{M}_K^{\mathrm{ope}}(z)\mathcal{M}_K(g)$, we have the following equalities:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{M}^{\mathrm{ope}}(z)\mathcal{M}(g) &= (\Delta - 1)\left[-\sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \frac{(-1)^k a_k k!}{z(z+1)\dots(z+k)}\right] \\ &= -\sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \frac{(-1)^k a_k k!}{(z+1)(z+2)\dots(z+k+1)} + \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \frac{(-1)^k a_k k!}{z(z+1)\dots(z+k)} \\ &= \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} (-1)^k a_k k! \left[\frac{-1}{(z+1)(z+2)\dots(z+k+1)} + \frac{1}{z(z+1)\dots(z+k)}\right] \\ &= -\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \frac{(-1)^k a_{k-1} k!}{z(z+1)\dots(z+k)} \end{aligned} \tag{14}$$

From equalities (13) and (14), we obtain the proof of Proposition 2.7. □

The following lemma is a fundamental property of $\mathcal{M}_K(g)$ for $g \in \overline{\mathbb{Q}}[[z]]$.

Lemma 2.8. *Let j be a non-negative integer. For $g(z) = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} a_k z^k \in K[[z]]$, we have the following equality:*

$$\begin{aligned} z(z+1)\dots(z+j-1)\mathcal{M}_K(g) = &-z(z+1)\dots(z+j-1)\sum_{k=0}^{j-1}(-1)^k a_k \frac{k!}{z(z+1)\dots(z+k)} \\ &+ (-1)^j \Delta^j \mathcal{M}_K\left(\left(\frac{d}{dz}\right)^j g\right), \end{aligned}$$

where, in the case of $j = 0$, we denote $z(z+1)\dots(z+j-1) = 1$ and $\sum_{k=0}^{j-1}(-1)^k a_k \frac{k!}{z(z+1)\dots(z+k)} = 0$.

PROOF. In the case of $j = 0$, the claim is trivially true. In the following, we assume $j \geq 1$. From the definition of $\mathcal{M}_K(g)$, we have the following identities:

$$z(z+1)\dots(z+j-1)\mathcal{M}_K(g) = -z(z+1)\dots(z+j-1)\sum_{k=0}^{j-1}\frac{(-1)^k a_k k!}{z(z+1)\dots(z+k)} + \sum_{k=j}^{\infty}\frac{(-1)^k a_k k!}{(z+j)(z+j+1)\dots(z+k)}.$$

From the above equalities, it is enough to show that the following equality:

$$(-1)^j \Delta^j \mathcal{M}_K\left(\left(\frac{d}{dz}\right)^j g\right) = \sum_{k=j}^{\infty}\frac{(-1)^k a_k k!}{(z+j)(z+j+1)\dots(z+k)}. \tag{15}$$

Using the following equalities $\left(\frac{d}{dz}\right)^j g(z) = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty}(k+1)\dots(k+j)a_{k+j}z^k$ and Lemma 2.3, we obtain the following equalities:

$$\begin{aligned}(-1)^j \Delta^j \mathcal{M}_K\left(\left(\frac{d}{dz}\right)^j g\right) &= \Delta^j\left(\sum_{k=0}^{\infty}\frac{(-1)^{k+j}(k+j)!a_{k+j}}{z(z+1)\dots(z+k)}\right)\\ &= \sum_{k=0}^{\infty}\frac{(-1)^{k+j}(k+j)!a_{k+j}}{(z+j)(z+j+1)\dots(z+k+j)}\\ &= \sum_{k=j}^{\infty}\frac{(-1)^k k! a_k}{(z+j)(z+j+1)\dots(z+k)}.\end{aligned}$$

Thus we obtain equality (15). This completes the proof of Lemma 2.8. □

2.2.1 Relation between formal Mellin transform and p-adic Stieltjes transform

In this section, we recall p-adic Stieltjes transform and show how the p-adic Stieltjes transform is related with the formal Mellin transform introduced in Definition 2.4. We explain about new notations below:

Notations :

$\mathcal{O}(U)$: the set of rigid analytic functions on any admissible open set U of $\mathbb{P}^1(\mathbb{C}_p)$

$LA(\mathbb{Z}_p, \mathbb{C}_p)$: the set of $\mathbb{C}_p$-valued locally analytic functions on $\mathbb{Z}_p$

$\mathcal{D}(LA(\mathbb{Z}_p, \mathbb{C}_p)) := \mathrm{Hom}_{\mathbb{C}_p}^{cont}(LA(\mathbb{Z}_p, \mathbb{C}_p), \mathbb{C}_p)$: the set of $\mathbb{C}_p$-valued distribution on $\mathbb{Z}_p$

REMARK 2.9. (i) For the rigid analytic function, we use only the case for $U = D_p(0, t^-)$ for $0 < t$ or $D_p(\infty, 1^-)$. In this case, we understand

$$\mathcal{O}(U) = \begin{cases} \{\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} a_n z^n |\ |a_n| r^n \to 0 (n \to \infty) \text{ for any } 0 < r < t\} & \text{if } U = D_p(0, t^-),\\ \{\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} a_n z^{-n} |\ |a_n| r^{-n} \to 0 (n \to \infty) \text{ for any } 1 < r < \infty\} & \text{if } U = D_p(\infty, 1^-). \end{cases}$$

(ii) Let $h \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$. We define $f : \mathbb{Z}_p \longrightarrow \mathbb{C}_p$ as to be a $\mathbb{C}_p$-valued locally analytic function defined in a closed disk of radius p^{-h} when $f|_{a+p^h\mathbb{Z}_p}$ is an analytic function for all $a \in \mathbb{Z}_p$. We denote the set of $\mathbb{C}_p$-valued locally analytic function of radius p^{-h} by $LA_h(\mathbb{Z}_p, \mathbb{C}_p)$. Since $\mathbb{Z}_p$ is compact, we have

$LA(\mathbb{Z}_p, \mathbb{C}_p) = \bigcup_{h \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}} LA_h(\mathbb{Z}_p, \mathbb{C}_p)$. We endow $LA_h(\mathbb{Z}_p, \mathbb{C}_p)$ with the maximal valued norm, which allows that the set $LA_h(\mathbb{Z}_p, \mathbb{C}_p)$ becomes a $\mathbb{C}_p$-Banach space for each $h \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$. The set of $\mathbb{C}_p$-valued distribution on $\mathbb{Z}_p$, $\mathrm{Hom}^{cont}_{\mathbb{C}_p}(LA(\mathbb{Z}_p, \mathbb{C}_p), \mathbb{C}_p)$, is defined by

$$\mathrm{Hom}^{cont}_{\mathbb{C}_p}(LA(\mathbb{Z}_p, \mathbb{C}_p), \mathbb{C}_p) = \lim_{\leftarrow_h} \mathrm{Hom}^{cont}_{\mathbb{C}_p}(LA_h(\mathbb{Z}_p, \mathbb{C}_p), \mathbb{C}_p).$$

Definition 2.10. We define the p-adic Stieltjes transform $\mathcal{S} : \mathcal{D}(LA(\mathbb{Z}_p, \mathbb{C}_p)) \longrightarrow \mathcal{O}(D_p(\infty, 1^-))$ by

$$\mathcal{S}(\mu) = -\int_{\mathbb{Z}_p} \frac{1}{z+t} d\mu(t).$$

We denote the Amice transform $\mathcal{A} : \mathcal{D}(LA(\mathbb{Z}_p, \mathbb{C}_p)) \longrightarrow \mathcal{O}(D_p(0, 1^-))$ by $\mathcal{A}(\mu) = \int_{\mathbb{Z}_p} (1+t)^z d\mu(t)$ (*refer* [2]), which is indeed an homeomorphism and isomorphism.

Remark 2.11. We remark that the well-definedness of $\mathcal{S}$, namely the guarantee for $\mathcal{S}(\mu) \in \mathcal{O}(D_p)$, is obtained the following argument. We define the set of Krasner analytic functions on $\overline{\mathbb{Z}}_p := \mathbb{C}_p \setminus \mathbb{Z}_p$ by

$$H_0(\overline{\mathbb{Z}}_p) := \{\phi : \overline{\mathbb{Z}_p} \to \mathbb{C}_p |\ \phi \text{ satisfies } (1), (2)\}.$$

(1) For $r > 0$, we denote $\overline{D}_{\mathbb{Z}_p}(r) := \{z \in \mathbb{C}_p |\ \min_{x \in \mathbb{Z}_p} |z - x| \geq r\}$. For any $r > 0$, there exists a family of rational functions $\{f_{r,n}\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ whose member have poles only on $\mathbb{Z}_p$ satisfying the limit of $\{f_{r,n}\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ converges to ϕ uniformly on $\overline{D}_{\mathbb{Z}_p}(r)$.

(2) $\lim_{|z|_p \to \infty} \phi(z) = 0$.

From Theorem of Vishik [18] (cf. [10, p. 138]), the following morphism gives the topological isomorphism

$$\mathcal{S}' : \mathcal{D}(\mathbb{Z}_p, \mathbb{C}_p) \xrightarrow{\cong} H_0(\overline{\mathbb{Z}}_p),\ \mu \mapsto -\int_{\mathbb{Z}_p} \frac{1}{z+t} d\mu(t).$$

The Stieltjes transform $\mathcal{S}$ defined in Definition 2.10 is the composition of $\mathcal{S}'$ and the restriction map $H_0(\overline{\mathbb{Z}}_p) \hookrightarrow \mathcal{O}(D_p)$.

We have the following principal relation between the formal Mellin transform and the p-adic Stieltjes transform.

Proposition 2.12. *Let $\tau \in I^{(p)}$. We denote $\{g(z) \in \overline{\mathbb{Q}}[[z]] |\ r_\tau(g) \geq 1\}$ by $\mathcal{B}_{p,\tau}$. Then we have the following commutative diagram:*

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathcal{B}_{p,\tau} & \xrightarrow{\mathcal{M}} & \mathcal{M}(\mathcal{B}_{p,\tau}) \\ {\scriptstyle\varphi}\downarrow & & \downarrow{\scriptstyle\tau} \\ \mathcal{D}(LA(\mathbb{Z}_p, \mathbb{C}_p)) & \xrightarrow[\mathcal{S}]{} & \mathcal{O}(D_p(\infty, 1^-)), \end{array}$$

where φ is defined by $g(z) \mapsto \mathcal{A}^{-1}(\tau(g))$.

Proof. Let $g(z) \in \mathcal{B}_{p,\tau}$. We denote $\varphi(\tau(g))$ by $\mu_{\tau(g)}$ and $g(e^z - 1) = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} b_k \frac{z^k}{k!}$. Then we have the following identity (cf. [1]):

$$\tau(b_k) = \int_{\mathbb{Z}_p} t^k d\mu_{\tau(g)}(t) \text{ for all } k \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}. \tag{16}$$

On the other hand, we have the following equality for $z \in D_p(\infty, 1^-)$:

$$\mathcal{S}(\mu) = -\int_{\mathbb{Z}_p} \frac{1}{z+t} d\mu_{\tau(g)}(t) = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \int_{\mathbb{Z}_p} t^k \mu_{\tau(g)}(t) \left(\frac{-1}{z}\right)^{k+1}. \tag{17}$$

From equalities (16) and (17), we obtain the proof of Proposition 2.12. □

REMARK 2.13. From Proposition 2.12, we can define $\tau(\mathcal{M}(g))(\alpha)$ for $g(z) \in \mathcal{B}_{p,\tau}$ and $\alpha \in D_p(\infty, 1^-)$.

3 Padé approximation of formal Laurent series

In this section, we give a proof of Theorem 1.1 in Introduction. Throughout this section, we denote K as a field of characteristic 0. Firstly, we recall the definition of Padé approximation of formal Laurent series.

LEMMA 3.1. *Let m be a natural number and $f_1, \dots, f_m \in \frac{1}{z}K[[\frac{1}{z}]]$. We put $f_0 := 1$. For a m-tuple of natural numbers $\mathbf{n} := (n_1, \dots, n_m) \in \mathbb{N}^m$, there exsists a $(m+1)$-tuple of polynomials*

$$(P_0^{(\mathbf{n})}(z), P_1^{(\mathbf{n})}(z), \dots, P_m^{(\mathbf{n})}(z)) \in K[z]^{m+1},$$

satisfying the following conditions:

$$\begin{aligned} &\text{(i) } (P_0^{(\mathbf{n})}(z), P_1^{(\mathbf{n})}(z), \dots, P_m^{(\mathbf{n})}(z)) \neq 0, \\ &\text{(ii) } \deg P_v^{(\mathbf{n})}(z) \leq n_i \text{ for all } v = 1, 2, \dots m, \\ &\text{(iii) } \sum_{v=0}^{m} P_v^{(\mathbf{n})}(z) f_v(z) \in \left(\frac{1}{z}\right)^{\sum_{v=1}^{m}(n_v+1)}. \end{aligned}$$

Since Lemma 3.1 can be proved by using elementary linear algebra, we omit the proof of it.

DEFINITION 3.2. Let $(f_1, \dots, f_m) \in \frac{1}{z}K[[\frac{1}{z}]]^m$ and $\mathbf{n} := (n_1, \dots, n_m) \in \mathbb{N}^m$. We call a $(m+1)$-tuple of polynomials $\mathcal{P} := (P_0^{(\mathbf{n})}(z), P_1^{(\mathbf{n})}(z), \dots, P_m^{(\mathbf{n})}(z)) \in K[z]^{m+1}$ satisfying the condition (i), (ii) and (iii) in Lemma 3.1 as a $\mathbf{n}$-th Padé approximation of $(f_1, \dots, f_m)$. We put $N := \sum_{v=1}^{m}(n_v + 1)$ and denote

$$\mathcal{R}_{\mathcal{P}}(z) := \sum_{v=0}^{m} P_v^{(\mathbf{n})}(z) f_v(z) \in \frac{c_N(\mathcal{P})}{z^N} + \left(\frac{1}{z}\right)^{N+1}. \tag{18}$$

REMARK 3.3. Let $(f_1, \dots, f_m) \in \frac{1}{z}K[[\frac{1}{z}]]^m$ and $\mathbf{n} := (n_1, \dots, n_m) \in \mathbb{N}^m$. For a $\mathbf{n}$-th Padé approximation of $(f_1, \dots, f_m)$ $(P_0^{(\mathbf{n})}(z), P_1^{(\mathbf{n})}(z), \dots, P_m^{(\mathbf{n})}(z)) \in K[z]^{m+1}$, we note that $-P_0^{(\mathbf{n})}(z)$ is the polynomial part of $\sum_{v=1}^{m} P_v^{(\mathbf{n})}(z) f_v(z)$.

We fix m-formal power series

$$g_1(z) = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} a_{1,k} z^k, \dots, g_m(z) = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} a_{m,k} z^k \in K[[z]].$$

We put $f_0 := 1$ and denote

$$f_1 := \mathcal{M}_K(g_1), \dots, f_m := \mathcal{M}_K(g_m) \in \tfrac{1}{z}K\left[\left[\tfrac{1}{z}\right]\right].$$

Let $\mathbf{n} := (n_1, \dots, n_m) \in \mathbb{N}^m$ and $P_v^{(\mathbf{n})}(z) \in K[z]$ be polynomials with $\deg P_v^{(\mathbf{n})} \leq n_v$ for $1 \leq v \leq m$. We put

$$P_v^{(\mathbf{n})}(z) = \sum_{j=0}^{n_v} p_{v,j}^{(\mathbf{n})} \frac{z(z+1)\dots(z+j-1)}{j!} \text{ for all } 1 \leq v \leq m.$$

Using the above notations, we prove Theorem 1.1.

[Proof of Theorem 1.1]

Firstly, we prove the equivalence of (i) and (ii) in Theorem 1.1. From Lemma 2.8, we obtain the following equalities for $1 \leq v \leq m$:

$$
\begin{aligned}
P_v^{(\mathbf{n})}(z) f_v(z) &= \left(\sum_{j=0}^{n_v} \frac{p_{v,j}^{(\mathbf{n})}}{j!} z(z+1)\dots(z+j-1) \right) \mathcal{M}_K(g_v) \\
&= \sum_{j=1}^{n_v} p_{v,j}^{(\mathbf{n})} \frac{z(z+1)\dots(z+j-1)}{j!} \sum_{k=0}^{j-1} \frac{(-1)^k a_{v,k} k!}{z(z+1)\dots(z+k)} \\
&\quad + \sum_{j=0}^{n_v} (-1)^j \frac{p_{v,j}^{(\mathbf{n})}}{j!} \Delta^j \mathcal{M}_K \left(\left(\frac{d}{dz} \right)^j g \right).
\end{aligned} \tag{19}
$$

From Proposition 2.7, we obtain the following equalities:

$$
\begin{aligned}
\sum_{j=0}^{n_v} (-1)^j \frac{p_{v,j}^{(\mathbf{n})}}{j!} \Delta^j \mathcal{M}_K \left(\left(\frac{d}{dz} \right)^j g_v \right) &= \sum_{j=0}^{n_v} (-1)^j \frac{p_{v,j}^{(\mathbf{n})}}{j!} \left(\mathcal{M}_K^{\mathrm{ope}} \times \mathcal{M}_K \right) \left((z+1)^j \left(\frac{d}{dz} \right)^j g_v \right) \\
&= \mathcal{M}_K \left(\sum_{j=0}^{n_v} (-1)^j \frac{p_{v,j}^{(\mathbf{n})}}{j!} (z+1)^j \left(\frac{d}{dz} \right)^j g_v \right).
\end{aligned}
$$

On the other hand, we have the following equalities:

$$
\begin{aligned}
(-1)^j \frac{p_{v,j}^{(\mathbf{n})}}{j!} (z+1)^j \left(\frac{d}{dz} \right)^j g_v &= (-1)^j \frac{p_{v,j}^{(\mathbf{n})}}{j!} \left(\sum_{k=0}^{j} \binom{j}{k} z^k \right) \left(\sum_{k=0}^{\infty} (k+1)\dots(k+j) a_{v,k+j} z^k \right) \\
&= (-1)^j p_{v,j}^{(\mathbf{n})} \left(\sum_{k=0}^{j} \binom{j}{k} z^k \right) \left(\sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \binom{k+j}{j} a_{v,k+j} z^k \right) \\
&= (-1)^j p_{v,j}^{(\mathbf{n})} \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \left(\sum_{l=0}^{k} \binom{j}{l} \binom{k+j-l}{j} a_{v,k+j-l} \right) z^k. \qquad (20)
\end{aligned}
$$

For the third equality of (20), we mean $\binom{j}{l} = 0$ in the case of $j < l$. From the definition of $\mathcal{M}_K$, we have the following equivalence relations:

$$
\mathcal{M}_K \left(\sum_{v=1}^{m} \sum_{j=0}^{n_v} (-1)^j \frac{p_{v,j}^{(\mathbf{n})}}{j!} (z+1)^j \left(\frac{d}{dz} \right)^j g_v \right) \in \left(\frac{1}{z} \right)^{\sum_{v=1}^{m} (n_v+1)}. \tag{21}
$$

$$
\sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \sum_{v=1}^{m} \sum_{j=0}^{n_v} (-1)^j p_{v,j}^{(\mathbf{n})} \left(\sum_{l=0}^{k} \binom{j}{l} \binom{k+j-l}{j} a_{v,k+j-l} \right) z^k \in (z)^{\sum_{v=1}^{m} (n_v+1)-1}. \tag{22}
$$

Since the relations (21) and (22) are equivalent to the conditions (i) and (ii) in Theorem 1.1 respectively, we obtain the equivalence of (i) and (ii).

Secondly, we prove the relations (3) and (4). Let $(P_0^{(\mathbf{n})}(z), P_1^{(\mathbf{n})}(z), \dots, P_m^{(\mathbf{n})}(z))$ is a $\mathbf{n}$-th Padé approximation of $(f_1, \dots, f_m)$. Then, from equality (19) and Remark 3.3, we obtain the equality:

$$
P_0^{(\mathbf{n})}(z) = -\sum_{v=1}^{m} \left(\sum_{j=1}^{n_v} p_{v,j}^{(\mathbf{n})} \frac{z(z+1)\dots(z+j-1)}{j!} \right) \left(\sum_{k=0}^{j-1} \frac{(-1)^k a_{v,k} k!}{z(z+1)\dots(z+k)} \right).
$$

This is the equality (3). Finally, the equality (4) in Theorem 1.1 is obtained from the identity

$$
\mathcal{R}^{(\mathbf{n})}(z) = \mathcal{M}_K \left(\sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \sum_{v=1}^{m} \sum_{j=0}^{n_v} (-1)^j p_{v,j}^{(\mathbf{n})} \left(\sum_{l=0}^{k} \binom{j}{l} \binom{k+j-l}{j} a_{v,k+j-l} \right) z^k \right),
$$

and Proposition 2.3. This completes the proof of Theorem 1.1.

4 Some estimations

In this section, we use Theorem 1.1 in the case of K is an algebraic number field to estimate some values which need to obtain Theorem 1.2. Firstly, we show the existence of the non-trivial solution $\{p_{v,j}^{(\mathbf{n})}\} \subset \mathbb{Z}$ of (2) in Theorem 1.1 whose absolute values are "enough" small. To show that we recall the following lemma, so-called Siegel's lemma.

LEMMA 4.1. (*cf.* [17]) *Let K be an algebraic number field. Let s, t be natural numbers satisfying $s > t$. Suppose there exist t-linear forms with coefficients $\mathcal{O}_K$*

$$L_j(X_1, \dots, X_s) := a_{1,j}X_1 + \cdots + a_{s,j}X_s \text{ for } 1 \le j \le t, \tag{23}$$

satisfying the following condition:

$$\text{There exists an integer } A \text{ satisfying } \overline{|a_{i,j}|} < A \text{ for all } 1 \le i \le s,\ 1 \le j \le t.$$

Then there exists a non-trivial solution $(x_1, \dots, x_s) \in \mathcal{O}_K^s$ of (23) satisfying

$$\overline{|x_i|} < c(csA)^{\frac{t}{s-t}} \text{ for all } 1 \le i \le s,$$

where $c > 0$ is a constant depending only on K. □

To use Lemma 4.1, we estimate the upper bound of the absolute values of the coefficients of the linear relations (2) in Theorem 1.1 of $\{p_{v,j}^{(\mathbf{n})}\}_{1 \le v \le m, 0 \le k \le j}$. In the following, we assume $g_v(z) = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} a_{v,k} z^k \in K[[z]]$. For $j \in \mathbb{Z}_{\ge 0}$, we denote $\mathrm{den}(a_{v,k})_{1 \le v \le m, 0 \le k \le j}$ by e_j. Furthermore, we assume the following conditions for $g_1, \dots, g_m$:

ASSMPTION 4.2.

(i) There exists $\delta > 0$ and $C_1 > 0$ satisfying $\overline{|a_{v,j}|} \le \delta C_1^j$ for all $j \in \mathbb{Z}_{\ge 0}$ and $1 \le v \le m$,

(ii) For any $\epsilon > 0$, there exists $\gamma = \gamma(\epsilon) > 0$ and $C_2 \ge 1$ satisfying $e_j \le \gamma C_2^{j(1+\epsilon)}$ for all $j \in \mathbb{Z}_{\ge 0}$.

LEMMA 4.3. *We put $n := \max_{1 \le v \le m}\{n_v\}$. Then we have the following inequality for all $0 \le k \le \sum_{v=1}^{m}(n_v + 1) - 2$.*

$$\overline{\left|(-1)^j \sum_{l=0}^{k} \binom{j}{l} \binom{k+j-l}{j} a_{v,k+j-l}\right|} \le \begin{cases} e^{o(n)} 2^{(m+2)n} C_1^{(m+1)n} & \text{if } C_1 > \frac{1}{2}, \\ e^{o(n)} 2^n & \text{if } C_1 \le \frac{1}{2}. \end{cases} \tag{24}$$

PROOF. Firstly, we consider to the case of $j \le k \le m(n+1)$. From the trivial inequalities $\binom{k}{l} \le 2^k$ and $\binom{k+j-l}{k} \le 2^{k+j-l}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} &\overline{\left|(-1)^j \sum_{l=0}^{j} \binom{j}{l} \binom{k+j-l}{j} a_{v,k+j-l}\right|} \\ &\le \sum_{l=0}^{j} 2^j 2^{k+j-l} C_1^{k+j-l} \\ &= O(1) 2^j (2C_1)^{k+j} \sum_{l=0}^{j} (2C_1)^{-l}. \end{aligned}$$

By classifying the case about the size of C_1, we obtain the following upper bound of $(2C_1)^{k+j}\sum_{l=0}^{j}(2C_1)^{-l}$.

1.1 (In the case of $C_1 > \frac{1}{2}$)

$$\begin{aligned}2^j(2C_1)^{k+j}\sum_{l=0}^{j}(2C_1)^{-l} &\le 2^n(2C_1)^{m(n+1)+n}(n+1)\\ &= (n+1)(2C_1)^m 2^{(m+2)n}C_1^{m(n+1)}.\end{aligned}$$

1.2 (In the case of $C_1 = \frac{1}{2}$)

$$2^j(2C_1)^{k+j}\sum_{l=0}^{j}(2C_1)^{-l} \le (n+1)2^n.$$

1.3 (In the case of $C_1 < \frac{1}{2}$)

$$\begin{aligned}2^j(2C_1)^{k+j}\sum_{l=0}^{j}(2C_1)^{-l} &= 2^j(2C_1)^{k+j}\frac{(2C_1)^{-j-1}-1}{(2C_1)^{-1}-1}\\ &\le \frac{1}{(2C_1)^{-1}-1}2^j(2C_1)^{k+j}(2C_1)^{-j-1}\\ &= \frac{(2C_1)^{-1}}{(2C_1)^{-1}-1}2^j(2C_1)^k\\ &\le \frac{(2C_1)^{-1}}{(2C_1)^{-1}-1}2^n.\end{aligned}$$

Secondly, we consider to the case of $k < j$.

$$\begin{aligned}\overline{\left|(-1)^j\sum_{0\le l\le k, l\le j}\binom{k}{l}\binom{k+j-l}{k}a_{v,k+j-l}\right|} &= \overline{\left|(-1)^j\sum_{0\le l\le k}\binom{j}{l}\binom{k+j-l}{j}a_{v,k+j-l}\right|}\\ &\le \sum_{0\le l\le k}2^j 2^{k+j-l}C_1^{k+j-l}\\ &= O(1)2^j(2C_1)^{k+j}\sum_{0\le j\le k}(2C_1)^{-l}.\end{aligned}$$

We estimate the upper bound of $(2C_1)^{k+j}\sum_{0\le j\le k}(2C_1)^{-l}$ by the same way as the first case.

2.1 (In the case of $C_1 > \frac{1}{2}$)

$$2^j(2C_1)^{k+j}\sum_{0\le l\le k}(2C_1)^{-l} < (n+1)2^n(2C_1)^{2n}C_1^{m(n+1)}.$$

2.2 (In the case of $C_1 = \frac{1}{2}$)

$$2^j(2C_1)^{k+j}\sum_{0\le l\le k}(2C_1)^{-l} \le (n+1)2^n.$$

2.3 (In the case of $C_1 < \frac{1}{2}$)

$$\begin{aligned} 2^j(2C_1)^{k+j}\sum_{0\le l\le k}(2C_1)^{-l} &= 2^j(2C_1)^{k+j}\frac{(2C_1)^{-k-1}-1}{(2C_1)^{-1}-1} \\ &\le \frac{1}{(2C_1)^{-1}-1}2^j(2C_1)^{k+j}(2C_1)^{-k-1} \\ &= \frac{(2C_1)^{-1}}{(2C_1)^{-1}-1}2^j(2C_1)^j \\ &< \frac{(2C_1)^{-1}}{(2C_1)^{-1}-1}2^n. \end{aligned}$$

To summarize the inequalities of first case and second case, we obtain the following inequalities:

$$\overline{\left|(-1)^j\sum_{l=0}^{k}\binom{j}{l}\binom{k+j-l}{j}a_{v,k+j-l}\right|} \le \begin{cases} O(1)(n+1)(2C_1)^m 2^{(m+2)n}C_1^{(m+1)n} & \text{if } C_1 > \frac{1}{2}, \\ O(1)(n+1)2^n & \text{if } C_1 = \frac{1}{2}, \\ O(1)\dfrac{(2C_1)^{-1}}{(2C_1)^{-1}-1}2^n & \text{if } C_1 < \frac{1}{2}. \end{cases} \tag{25}$$

From the inequality (25), we obtain the inequality (24). This completes the proof of Lemma 4.3. □

By using Lemmas 4.1 and 4.3, we obtain the following corollary.

Corollary 4.4. *We use the same notation as Lemma* 4.3. *Let ϵ is a positive real number. There exists a non-trivial solution of $\{p_{v,j,\epsilon}\}_{1\le v\le m,0\le j\le n_v} \subset \mathcal{O}_K$ of* (2) *in Theorem* 1.1 *satisfying:*

$$\overline{|p^{(\mathbf{n})}_{v,j,\epsilon}|} \le \begin{cases} e^{o(n)}2^{(m+2)n}(C_1C_2^{1+\epsilon})^{(m+1)n} & \text{if } C_1 > \frac{1}{2}, \\ e^{o(n)}2^nC_2^{(1+\epsilon)(m+1)n} & \text{if } C_1 \le \frac{1}{2}. \end{cases} \tag{26}$$

In the following, we fix a enough small positive real number ϵ and $\{p^{(\mathbf{n})}_{v,j,\epsilon}\}_{1\le v\le m,1\le j\le n_v} \subset \mathcal{O}_K$ satisfying corollary 4.4. For simplicity, we denote $p^{(\mathbf{n})}_{v,j,\epsilon}$ by $p^{(\mathbf{n})}_{v,j}$ and put

$$P^{(\mathbf{n})}_v(z) = \sum_{j=0}^{n_v} p^{(\mathbf{n})}_{v,j}\frac{z(z+1)\dots(z+j-1)}{j!} \text{ for } 1\le v\le m, \tag{27}$$

$$P^{(\mathbf{n})}_0(z) = -\sum_{v=1}^{m}\sum_{j=1}^{n_v} p^{(\mathbf{n})}_{v,j}\left(\frac{z(z+1)\dots(z+j-1)}{j!}\right)\left(\sum_{k=0}^{j-1}\frac{(-1)^k a_{v,k}k!}{z(z+1)\dots(z+k)}\right), \tag{28}$$

$$\mathcal{R}^{(\mathbf{n})}(z) = \sum_{k=\sum_{v=1}^m(n_v+1)-1}^{\infty}\left(\sum_{v=1}^{m}\sum_{j=0}^{n_v}(-1)^j p^{(\mathbf{n})}_{v,j}\sum_{l=0}^{k}\binom{j}{l}\binom{k+j-l}{j}a_{v,k+j-l}\right)\frac{(-1)^{k+1}k!}{z(z+1)\dots(z+k)}. \tag{29}$$

Lemma 4.5. *Let $n := \max(n_1,\dots,n_m)$ be an element of $\mathbb{N}^m$. For $\alpha \in \mathbb{Q}^*$, we have the following relations:*

(i) $\left[\mathrm{den}(\alpha)^n \prod_{q:\text{prime},\ q\mid\mathrm{den}(\alpha)} q^{\left[\frac{n}{q-1}\right]}\right] P^{(\mathbf{n})}_v(\alpha) \in \mathcal{O}_K$ *for all* $1\le v\le m$,

(ii) $\left[d_ne_n\mathrm{den}(\alpha)^n \prod_{q:\text{prime},\ q\mid\mathrm{den}(\alpha)} q^{\left[\frac{n}{q-1}\right]}\right] P^{(\mathbf{n})}_0(\alpha) \in \mathcal{O}_K$.

Especially, we obtain $d_ne_n\mathrm{den}(\alpha)^n\prod_{q:\text{prime},q\mid\mathrm{den}(\alpha)} q^{\left[\frac{n}{q-1}\right]}P^{(\mathbf{n})}_v(\alpha) \in \mathcal{O}_K$ for all $\alpha\in\mathbb{Q}^*$, $0\le v\le m$.

PROOF. (i) Using the identity

$$\mathrm{den}\left(\frac{(\alpha)_j}{j!}\right) = \mathrm{den}(\alpha)^j \prod_{q:\text{prime},\ q|\mathrm{den}(\alpha)} q^{\left[\frac{j}{q-1}\right]}, \tag{30}$$

for $\alpha \in \mathbb{Q}^*$ and $j \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$ (cf. [6, Lemma 2.2]) and equality (27), we obtain the condition (i).

(ii) Let k, j be natural numbers satisfying $k < j$. Remark that we have the following equalities:

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{z(z+1)\dots(z+j-1)}{j!}\frac{k!}{z(z+1)\dots(z+k)} &= \frac{k!}{j(j-1)\dots(j-k)}\frac{(z+k+1)_{j-k-1}}{(j-k-1)!} \\ &= \left[(-1)^k\sum_{t=0}^{k}(-1)^t\binom{k}{t}\frac{1}{j-t}\right]\frac{(z+k+1)_{j-k-1}}{(j-k-1)!}. \end{aligned} \tag{31}$$

In the right hand side of (28), substituting the equality (31) and $z = \alpha \in \mathbb{Q}^*$, we obtain

$$P_0^{(\mathbf{n})}(\alpha) = -\sum_{v=1}^{m}\sum_{j=1}^{n_v} p_{v,j}^{(\mathbf{n})}\sum_{k=0}^{j-1} a_{v,k}\left[\sum_{t=0}^{k}(-1)^t\binom{k}{t}\frac{1}{j-t}\right]\frac{(\alpha+k+1)_{j-k-1}}{(j-k-1)!}. \tag{32}$$

To eliminate the denominator of $\{a_{v,k}\}$, $\left\{\frac{1}{j-t}\right\}$ and $\left\{\frac{(\alpha+k+1)_{j-k-1}}{(j-k-1)!}\right\}$ in the right hand-side of (32), we multiple e_n, d_n and $\mathrm{den}(\alpha)^n\prod_{q|\mathrm{den}(\alpha)} q^{\left[\frac{n}{q-1}\right]}$ (cf. equality (30)) respectively. This completes of the proof of condition (ii). □

LEMMA 4.6. *Let $n := \max(n_1, \dots, n_m)$ be an element of $\mathbb{N}^m$ and $\alpha \in \mathbb{Q}^*$. We put $l = l(\alpha)$ be a positive integer satisfying $l < |\alpha| \leq l+1$. Then we have the following inequalities:*

$$\max_{0\leq v\leq m}\overline{|P_v^{(\mathbf{n})}(\alpha)|} \leq \begin{cases} e^{o(n)}2^{(m+3)n}C_1^{(m+2)n}C_2^{(1+\epsilon)(m+1)n} & \text{if } C_1 > 1, \\ e^{o(n)}2^{(m+3)n}(C_1C_2^{1+\epsilon})^{(m+1)n} & \text{if } \frac{1}{2} < C_1 \leq 1, \\ e^{o(n)}4^nC_2^{(1+\epsilon)(m+1)n} & \text{if } C_1 \leq \frac{1}{2}. \end{cases} \tag{33}$$

PROOF. Firstly, we estimate the upper bound of $\overline{|P_v^{(\mathbf{n})}(\alpha)|}$ for $1 \leq v \leq m$. For $j \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\left|\frac{(\alpha)_j}{j!}\right| &\leq \frac{(l+1)(l+2)\dots(l+j)}{j!} \\ &= \binom{j+l}{l} \leq 2^{j+l}. \end{aligned} \tag{34}$$

Substituting $z = \alpha$ for the equality (27), we obtain the following inequalities for $1 \leq v \leq m$:

$$\overline{|P_v^{(\mathbf{n})}(\alpha)|} \leq \sum_{j=0}^{n_v}\overline{|p_{v,j}^{(\mathbf{n})}|}\left|\frac{\alpha(\alpha+1)\dots(\alpha+j-1)}{j!}\right|. \tag{35}$$

Using inequality (34) and (26) for (35), we obtain

$$\overline{|P_v^{(\mathbf{n})}(\alpha)|} \leq \begin{cases} e^{o(n)}2^{(m+3)n}(C_1C_2^{1+\epsilon})^{(m+1)n} & \text{if } C_1 > \frac{1}{2}, \\ e^{o(n)}2^{2n}C_2^{(1+\epsilon)(m+1)n} & \text{if } C_1 = \frac{1}{2}, \\ e^{o(n)}2^{2n}C_2^{(1+\epsilon)(m+1)n} & \text{if } C_1 < \frac{1}{2}. \end{cases} \tag{36}$$

for all $1 \leq v \leq m$.

Secondly, we estimate the upper bound of $\overline{|P_0^{(\mathbf{n})}(\alpha)|}$. Let k, j be natural numbers satisfying $k < j$. We show the following inequality:

$$\left|\frac{\alpha(\alpha+1)\dots(\alpha+j-1)}{j!}\frac{k!}{\alpha(\alpha+1)\dots(\alpha+k)}\right| \leq \frac{k!(l+k+2)\dots(l+j)}{j!} \leq \frac{2^{j+l}}{k+1}. \tag{37}$$

In the case of $k = j-1$, since we have the equality $\left|\frac{\alpha(\alpha+1)\dots(\alpha+j-1)}{j!}\frac{k!}{\alpha(\alpha+1)\dots(\alpha+k)}\right| = \frac{1}{j}$, we have the inequality (37). We assume $k < j-1$. In this case, since we have the inequality

$$\begin{aligned}\left|\frac{\alpha(\alpha+1)\dots(\alpha+j-1)}{j!}\frac{k!}{\alpha(\alpha+1)\dots(\alpha+k)}\right| &\leq \frac{k!(l+k+2)\dots(l+j)}{j!} \\ &= \frac{k!l!}{(l+k+1)!}\binom{j+l}{j} \\ &= \frac{k!}{(l+1)\dots(l+k+1)}\binom{j+l}{j} \\ &\leq \frac{2^{j+l}}{k+1},\end{aligned}$$

we obtain the inequality (37). Substituting $z = \alpha$ in the equality (28), we get

$$\begin{aligned}\overline{|P_0^{(\mathbf{n})}(\alpha)|} &\leq \sum_{v=1}^{m}\sum_{j=1}^{n_v}\overline{|p_{v,j}^{(\mathbf{n})}|}\sum_{k=0}^{j-1}\delta C_1^k\left|\frac{\alpha(\alpha+1)\dots(\alpha+j-1)}{j!}\frac{k!}{\alpha(\alpha+1)\dots(\alpha+k)}\right| \\ &\leq \delta\sum_{v=1}^{m}\sum_{j=1}^{n_v}\overline{|p_{v,j}^{(\mathbf{n})}|}2^{j+l}\sum_{k=0}^{j-1}\frac{C_1^k}{k+1} \\ &\leq \delta\sum_{v=1}^{m}\sum_{j=1}^{n_v}\overline{|p_{v,j}^{(\mathbf{n})}|}2^{j+l}\sum_{k=0}^{j-1}C_1^k,\end{aligned} \tag{38}$$

where δ is the positive real number that appeared in Assmption 4.2 (i). Note that to obtain the second inequality of (38), we use the inequality (37). In the inequality (38), using the inequality

$$\sum_{k=0}^{j-1}C_1^k \leq \begin{cases}\dfrac{C_1^j-1}{C_1-1} & \text{if } C_1 > 1, \\ j & \text{if } C_1 \leq 1,\end{cases}$$

and inequality (26), we obtain the desire inequality.

$$\overline{|P_0^{(\mathbf{n})}(\alpha)|} \leq \begin{cases}e^{o(n)}2^{(m+3)n}C_1^{(m+2)n}C_2^{(1+\epsilon)(m+1)n} & \text{if } C_1 > 1, \\ e^{o(n)}2^{(m+3)n}(C_1C_2^{1+\epsilon})^{(m+1)n} & \text{if } \frac{1}{2} < C_1 \leq 1, \\ e^{o(n)}2^{2n}C_2^{(1+\epsilon)(m+1)n} & \text{if } C_1 = \frac{1}{2}, \\ e^{o(n)}2^{2n}C_2^{(1+\epsilon)(m+1)n} & \text{if } C_1 < \frac{1}{2}.\end{cases}$$

This completes the proof of Lemma 4.6. □

In the following, we put $V_p := \{\alpha \in \mathbb{Q} \mid |\alpha|_p > 1\}$ and assume

$$r_p(g_{v,p}) \geq 1 \text{ for all } g_1, \dots, g_m \in \mathbb{Q}[[z]]. \tag{39}$$

Lemma 4.7. *We put $r := \min_{1\leq v\leq m}\{r_p(g_{v,p})\}$ and $n := \max(n_1, \dots, n_m)$. Then for $\alpha \in V_p$ and for enough large $n \in \mathbb{N}$, we have:*

$$|\mathcal{R}^{(\mathbf{n})}(\alpha)|_p \leq e^{o(n)}\left[(r^{-1}+o(1))p^{-\frac{1}{p-1}}|\alpha|_p^{-1}\right]^{\sum_{v=1}^{m}(n_v+1)} \quad (n \to \infty).$$

PROOF. Firstly, we estimate an upper bound of $\{|a_{v,L}|_p\}_{k\leq L}$ for $k \in \mathbb{N}$. From the definition of radius of convergence, we have

$$\limsup_{k\to\infty} |a_{v,k}|_p^{\frac{1}{k}} \leq r^{-1}. \tag{40}$$

From the inequality (40), there exists a sequence of positive real numbers $(\epsilon(k))_{k\in\mathbb{N}}$ satisfying

$$\begin{aligned} &\epsilon(1) \geq \epsilon(2) \geq \ldots \geq \epsilon(k) \geq \ldots, \\ &\lim_{k\to\infty} \epsilon(k) = 0, \\ &|a_{v,L}|_p < (r^{-1} + \epsilon(k))^L \text{ for all } L \in \mathbb{N} \text{ satisfying } L \geq k. \end{aligned} \tag{41}$$

Let α be an element of V_p. From identity (29) and the property of non-archimedean valuation, we have

$$|\mathcal{R}^{(\mathbf{n})}(\alpha)|_p \leq \max_{k\geq \sum_{v=1}^m (n_v+1)-1} \left(\left| p_{v,j}^{(\mathbf{n})} \binom{j}{l} \binom{k+j-l}{l} a_{v,k+j-l} \right|_p |k!|_p |\alpha|_p^{-k-1} \right)_{1\leq v\leq m,\ 0\leq l\leq j}. \tag{42}$$

Furthermore we have the following inequalities:

$$\begin{aligned} &\text{(i)} \ \left| p_{v,j}^{(\mathbf{n})} \binom{j}{l} \binom{k+j-l}{l} \right|_p \leq 1, \\ &\text{(ii)} \ |a_{v,k+j-l}|_p = e^{o(n)}(r^{-1} + o(1)), \\ &\text{(iii)} \ |k!| \leq p^{\frac{-k}{p-1}} p^{\log(k)} = e^{o(n)} p^{\frac{-k}{p-1}}. \end{aligned}$$

Note that the above inequality (i) and (ii) are obtained from $p_{v,j}^{(\mathbf{n})} \in \mathcal{O}_K, \binom{j}{l}, \binom{k+j-l}{l} \in \mathbb{Z}$ and (41) respectively. From inequalities (i), (ii), and (iii) above, we have

$$\left(\left| p_{v,j}^{(\mathbf{n})} \binom{j}{l} \binom{k+j-l}{l} a_{v,k+j-l} \right|_p |k!|_p |\alpha|_p^{-k-1} \right) \leq e^{o(n)} \left[(r^{-1} + o(1)) p^{\frac{-1}{p-1}} |\alpha|_p^{-1} \right]^k \quad (n \to \infty), \tag{43}$$

for $k \geq \sum_{v=1}^m (n_v + 1) - 1$. Therefore, for enough large n, from inequalities (42) and (43), we obtain

$$|\mathcal{R}^{(\mathbf{n})}(\alpha)|_p \leq e^{o(n)} \left[(r^{-1} + o(1)) p^{\frac{-1}{p-1}} |\alpha|_p^{-1} \right]^{\sum_{v=1}^m (n_v+1)} \quad (n \to \infty).$$

This completes the proof of Lemma 4.7. □

5 Non-vanishing of determinant

Through this section, K is a field of characteristic 0. Note that we use some nations that are defined in Section 3 (cf. Definition 3.2).

DEFINITION 5.1. Let m be a natural number and $\mathbf{f} := (f_1, \ldots, f_m)$ be an element of $\frac{1}{z}K\left[\left[\frac{1}{z}\right]\right]^m$. We denote $f_v(z) = \sum_{k=0}^\infty f_{v,k} \left(\frac{1}{z}\right)^{k+1}$. For a m-tuple of natural numbers $\mathbf{n} := (n_1, \ldots, n_m) \in \mathbb{N}^m$, we put $N := \sum_{v=1}^m (n_v + 1)$. We denote the $N \times N$ matrix

$$\begin{pmatrix} f_{1,0} & \cdots & f_{1,n_1} & \cdots & f_{m,0} & \cdots & f_{m,n_m} \\ \vdots & \ddots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ f_{1,N-1} & \cdots & f_{m,N+n_1-1} & \cdots & f_{m,N-1} & \cdots & f_{m,n_m+N-1} \end{pmatrix},$$

by $A_{\mathbf{n}}(\mathbf{f})$ and define the $\mathbf{n}$-th Hankel determinant of $\mathbf{f}$ by

$$H_{\mathbf{n}}(\mathbf{f}) := \det A_{\mathbf{n}}(\mathbf{f}).$$

We denote the set $\{\mathbf{n} \in \mathbb{N}^m |\ H_{\mathbf{n}}(\mathbf{f}) \neq 0\}$ by $\Lambda(\mathbf{f})$.

PROPOSITION 5.2. *Let m be a natural number and $\mathbf{f} := (f_1, \dots, f_m)$ be an element of $\frac{1}{z}K\left[\left[\frac{1}{z}\right]\right]^m$. For an element of $\mathbf{n} \in \mathbb{N}^m$, we put $N := \sum_{v=1}^m (n_v + 1)$. Then, the following are equivalent.*

(i) *We have $\mathbf{n} \in \Lambda(\mathbf{f})$.*

(ii) *Let $\mathcal{P} := (P_0^{(\mathbf{n})}(z), P_1^{(\mathbf{n})}(z), \dots, P_m^{(\mathbf{n})}(z)) \in K[z]^{m+1}$ be a $\mathbf{n}$-th Padé approximation of $\mathbf{f}$. Then, we have*

$$\mathcal{R}_{\mathcal{P}}^{(\mathbf{n})}(z) \in \left(\frac{1}{z}\right)^N \setminus \left(\frac{1}{z}\right)^{N+1}.$$

(iii) *Put $\mathbf{n}_0 := \mathbf{n}$ and $\mathbf{n}_v := (n_1, \dots, n_{v-1}, n_v + 1, n_{v+1}, \dots, n_m) \in \mathbb{N}^m$ for $1 \leq v \leq m$. Let $(P_0^{(\mathbf{n}_v)}(z), P_1^{(\mathbf{n}_v)}(z), \dots, P_m^{(\mathbf{n}_v)}(z)) \in K[z]^{m+1}$ be a $\mathbf{n}_v$-th Padé approximation of $\mathbf{f}$ for $1 \leq v \leq m$. Then, we have*

$$\det \begin{pmatrix} P_0^{(\mathbf{n}_0)}(z) & P_1^{(\mathbf{n}_0)}(z) & \dots & P_m^{(\mathbf{n}_0)}(z) \\ P_0^{(\mathbf{n}_1)}(z) & P_1^{(\mathbf{n}_1)}(z) & \dots & P_m^{(\mathbf{n}_1)}(z) \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ P_0^{(\mathbf{n}_m)}(z) & P_1^{(\mathbf{n}_m)}(z) & \dots & P_m^{(\mathbf{n}_m)}(z) \end{pmatrix} \in K^*.$$

Before starting the proof of Proposition 5.2, we give two key lemmas.

LEMMA 5.3. *Let m be a natural number, $\mathbf{n} := (n_1, \dots, n_m) \in \mathbb{N}^m$ and $\mathbf{f} := (f_1, \dots, f_m) \in \frac{1}{z}K\left[\left[\frac{1}{z}\right]\right]^m$. Let $\mathcal{P} := (P_0(z), P_1(z), \dots, P_m(z)) \in K[z]^{m+1} \setminus \{(0, \dots, 0)\}$ and $P_v(z)$ satisfies $\deg P_v \leq n_v$ for $1 \leq v \leq m$. Then, the following are equivalent.*

(i) *$\mathcal{P}$ be a $\mathbf{n}$-th Padé approximation of $\mathbf{f}$.*

(ii) *Put $f_v(z) = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} f_{v,k} \left(\frac{1}{z}\right)^{k+1}$ and $P_v(z) = \sum_{j=0}^{n_v} p_{v,j} z^j$ for $1 \leq v \leq m$. Then, $\{f_{v,k}\}_{1 \leq v \leq m, 0 \leq k}$ and $\{p_{v,j}\}_{1 \leq v \leq m, 0 \leq j \leq n_v}$ satisfy the following relation:*

$$\begin{pmatrix} f_{1,0} & \dots & f_{1,n_1} & \dots & f_{m,0} & \dots & f_{m,n_m} \\ \vdots & \ddots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ f_{1,N-2} & \dots & f_{m,N+n_1-2} & \dots & f_{m,N-2} & \dots & f_{m,n_m+N-2} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} p_{1,0} \\ \vdots \\ p_{1,n_1} \\ \vdots \\ p_{m,0} \\ \vdots \\ p_{m,n_m} \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ \vdots \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}.$$

Since Lemma 5.3 is well-known, we omit the proof of it.

LEMMA 5.4. *Let m be a natural number, $\mathbf{n} \in \mathbb{N}^m$ and $\mathbf{f} := (f_1, \dots, f_m)$ be an element of $\frac{1}{z}K\left[\left[\frac{1}{z}\right]\right]^m$. Put $\mathbf{n}_0 := \mathbf{n}$ and $\mathbf{n}_v := (n_1, \dots, n_{v-1}, n_v + 1, n_{v+1}, \dots, n_m) \in \mathbb{N}^m$ for $1 \leq v \leq m$. For any $\mathbf{n}_v$-th Padé approximation of $\mathbf{f}$, $\mathcal{P}_v := (P_0^{(\mathbf{n}_v)}(z), P_1^{(\mathbf{n}_v)}(z), \dots, P_m^{(\mathbf{n}_v)}(z)) \in K[z]^{m+1}$ for $1 \leq v \leq m$, we have*

$$\Delta^{(\mathbf{n})}(z) := \det \begin{pmatrix} P_0^{(\mathbf{n}_0)}(z) & P_1^{(\mathbf{n}_0)}(z) & \dots & P_m^{(\mathbf{n}_0)}(z) \\ P_0^{(\mathbf{n}_1)}(z) & P_1^{(\mathbf{n}_1)}(z) & \dots & P_m^{(\mathbf{n}_1)}(z) \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ P_0^{(\mathbf{n}_m)}(z) & P_1^{(\mathbf{n}_m)}(z) & \dots & P_m^{(\mathbf{n}_m)}(z) \end{pmatrix} \in K. \tag{44}$$

PROOF. We put

$$P_w^{(\mathbf{n}_v)}(z) := \sum_{j=0}^{n_v+1} p_{w,j}^{(\mathbf{n}_v)} z^j \text{ for } 0 \le v \le m, 1 \le w \le m.$$

By adding the v-th column of the matrix (44) multiplied by $f_v(z)$ to the first column of the matrix (44) for $1 \le v \le m$, we obtain the following equality:

$$\Delta^{(\mathbf{n})}(z) = \det \begin{pmatrix} \mathcal{R}_{\mathcal{P}_0}(z) & P_1^{(\mathbf{n}_0)}(z) & \dots & P_m^{(\mathbf{n}_0)}(z) \\ \mathcal{R}_{\mathcal{P}_1}(z) & P_1^{(\mathbf{n}_1)}(z) & \dots & P_m^{(\mathbf{n}_1)}(z) \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ \mathcal{R}_{\mathcal{P}_m}(z) & P_1^{(\mathbf{n}_m)}(z) & \dots & P_m^{(\mathbf{n}_m)}(z) \end{pmatrix} \tag{45}$$

We denote the (t,u)-th cofactor of the matrix in (45) by $\Delta_{t,u}^{(\mathbf{n})}(z)$. Then, we obtain

$$\Delta^{(\mathbf{n})}(z) = \sum_{t=0}^{m} \mathcal{R}_{\mathcal{P}_t}(z) \Delta_{t,1}^{(\mathbf{n})}(z). \tag{46}$$

From the definition of $\Delta^{(\mathbf{n})}(z)$, $\mathcal{R}_{\mathcal{P}_w}(z)$, $P_w^{(\mathbf{n}_v)}(z)$ and the equality (46), we obtain the following relations.

$$\Delta^{(\mathbf{n})}(z) \in \mathcal{R}_{\mathcal{P}_0}(z) \prod_{v=1}^{s} P_v^{(\mathbf{n}_v)}(z) + \left(\frac{1}{z}\right), \tag{47}$$

$$\mathcal{R}_{\mathcal{P}_0}(z) \prod_{v=1}^{s} P_v^{(\mathbf{n}_v)}(z) \in c_N(\mathcal{P}_0) \prod_{v=1}^{m} p_{v,n}^{(\mathbf{n}_v)} + \left(\frac{1}{z}\right), \tag{48}$$

$$\Delta^{(\mathbf{n})}(z) \in K[z]. \tag{49}$$

By using the relations (47), (48) and (49), we obtain

$$\Delta^{(\mathbf{n})}(z) = c_N(\mathcal{P}_0) \prod_{v=1}^{m} p_{v,n}^{(\mathbf{n}_v)} \in K.$$

This completes the proof of Lemma 5.4. □

REMARK 5.5. Under the same notation as Lemma 5.4 and its proof, we have the following equivalence relations:

$$\begin{aligned} &\text{We have } \Delta^{(\mathbf{n})}(z) \in K^*. \\ &\mathcal{R}_{\mathcal{P}_0}(z) \in \left(\frac{1}{z}\right)^N \setminus \left(\frac{1}{z}\right)^{N+1} \text{ and } \deg P_v^{(\mathbf{n}_v)}(z) = n_v + 1 \text{ for all } 1 \le v \le m. \end{aligned} \tag{50}$$

[Proof of Proposition 5.2]

We put $f_v(z) = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} f_{v,k} \left(\frac{1}{z}\right)^{k+1}$ for $1 \le v \le m$. Firstly, we prove the equivalence of the condition (i) and the condition (ii). Let

$$\mathcal{P} := (P_0(z), P_1(z), \dots, P_m(z)) \in K[z]^{m+1}$$

be a $\mathbf{n}$-th Padé approximation of $\mathbf{f}$. Put

$$\begin{aligned} &P_v(z) = \sum_{j=0}^{n_v} p_{v,j} z^j \text{ for } 1 \le v \le m, \\ &\mathbf{p} := {}^t\Big(p_{1,0} \quad \dots \quad p_{1,n_1} \quad \dots \quad p_{m,0} \quad \dots \quad p_{m,n_m}\Big). \end{aligned}$$

Note that, since $\mathcal{P}$ is a $\mathbf{n}$-th Padé approximation of $\mathbf{f}$, we have $\mathbf{p} \neq 0$. Then, by using Lemma 5.3, we have the following relation:

$$A_{\mathbf{n}}(\mathbf{f}) \cdot \mathbf{p} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ \vdots \\ 0 \\ c_N(\mathcal{P}) \end{pmatrix}. \tag{51}$$

If we assume that the condition (i) holds, then from equality (51), we have $c_N(\mathcal{P})$. On the other hand, we assume that (ii) holds. If $\mathbf{n} \notin \Lambda(\mathbf{f})$, then there exists $\mathbf{p} \in M_{N,1}(K) \setminus \mathbf{0}$ satisfying $A_{\mathbf{n}}(\mathbf{f})\mathbf{p} = \mathbf{0}$. From Lemma 5.3, we obtain a $\mathbf{n}$-th Padé approximation of $\mathbf{f}$, say $\mathcal{P}$, satisfying $c_N(\mathcal{P}) = 0$. This contradicts the condition (ii). Secondly, we prove that the assrtion (i) implies the condition (iii). Let $\mathcal{P}_v := (P_0^{(\mathbf{n}_v)}(z), P_1^{(\mathbf{n}_v)}(z), \ldots, P_m^{(\mathbf{n}_v)}(z)) \in K[z]^{m+1}$ be a $\mathbf{n}_v$-th Padé approximation of $\mathbf{f}$ for $0 \leq v \leq m$. From Remark 5.5, it is sufficient to verify the condition (50). Since the condition (i) implies the condition (ii), we have $c_N(\mathcal{P}_0) \neq 0$. We put

$$P_w^{(\mathbf{n}_v)}(z) = \sum_{j=0}^{n_w} p_{w,j}^{(\mathbf{n}_v)} z^j \text{ if } w \neq v$$
$$P_v^{(\mathbf{n}_v)}(z) = \sum_{j=0}^{n_v+1} p_{v,j}^{(\mathbf{n}_v)} z^j,$$

for $1 \leq v \leq m$. If we assume $\deg P_v^{(\mathbf{n}_v)}(z) \leq n_v$, from Lemma 5.3, we have

$$A_{\mathbf{n}}(\mathbf{f}) \cdot \mathbf{p}_v = \mathbf{0}, \tag{52}$$

where

$$\mathbf{p}_v := {}^t\Big(p_{1,0} \quad \ldots \quad p_{1,n_1} \quad \ldots \quad p_{v,0} \quad \ldots p_{v,n_v} \quad \ldots \quad p_{m,0} \quad \ldots \quad p_{m,n_m}\Big).$$

Since $\mathbf{p}_v \neq \mathbf{0}$, the equality (52) contradicts the condition (i). This completes the proof of the condition (i) imples the condition (iii).

Finally, we prove that the condition (iii) implies the condition (ii). This fact is obtained by using the condition (50) in Remark 5.5. This completes the proof of Proposition 5.2. □

Remark 5.6. In the case of $m = 1$, we have the following theorem due to Kronecker which gives a necessary and sufficient condition that $|\Lambda(f)| < \infty$ holds.

Theorem 5.7. (*Kronecker*) ([15, Theorem 3.1])
Let f be an element of $\frac{1}{z}\overline{\mathbb{Q}}\left[\left[\frac{1}{z}\right]\right]$. Then the following are equivalent.
(i) $f \notin \overline{\mathbb{Q}}(z)$.
(ii) $\Lambda(f)$ is a infinite set. □

Using Theorem 5.7, we obtain the following corollary.

Corollary 5.8. *Let $g(z)$ be an element of $\overline{\mathbb{Q}}[[z]]$. Then the following are equivalent.*

(i) $|\Lambda(\mathcal{M}(g))| = \infty$,
(ii) $g(z) \notin \overline{\mathbb{Q}}[\log(1+z), (1+z)^\alpha | \alpha \in \overline{\mathbb{Q}}]$.

PROOF. From the property of formal Mellin transform, the following are equivalent. (cf. [7, p.155, (2.1.3)]) :

$$\text{(i)}' \ \mathcal{M}(g) \notin \overline{\mathbb{Q}}(z),$$
$$\text{(ii)}' \ g(z) \notin \overline{\mathbb{Q}}[\log(1+z), (1+z)^{\alpha} | \alpha \in \overline{\mathbb{Q}}].$$

Using the above equivalent conditions and Theorem 5.7 for $f = \mathcal{M}(g)$, we obtain the desire equivalence. □

6 Proof of Theorem 1.2

In this section, using the results of the previous sections, we give the proof of Theorem 1.2. Before starting the proof of Theorem 1.2, we recall some notations. Let $g(z) = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} a_k z^k$ be an element of $K[[z]]$. For a non-negative integer $j \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$, we denote $\mathrm{den}(a_k)_{0 \leq k \leq j}$ by e_j. We also denote the set of elements $g(z) = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} a_k z^k \in K[[z]]$ satisfying the following conditions:

(i) There exists $\delta > 0$ and $C_1 > 0$ satisfying $\overline{|a_j|} \leq \delta C_1^j$ for all $j \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$,

(ii) For any $\epsilon > 0$, there exists $\gamma = \gamma(\epsilon) > 0$ and $C_2 \geq 1$ satisfying $e_j \leq \gamma C_2^{j(1+\epsilon)}$ for all $j \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$.

by $\mathbf{G}(K, C_1, C_2)$. For the natural embedding $\iota_p : K[[z]] \hookrightarrow \mathbb{C}_p[[z]]$, we denote $\iota_p(g)$ by g_p for $g \in K[[z]]$ and the set $\{g(z) \in K[[z]] |\ r_p(g_p) \geq 1\}$ by $\mathcal{B}_{p,K}$.

[Proof of Theorem 1.2]

Let g be an element of $(\mathbf{G}(K, C_1, C_2) \cap \mathcal{B}_{p,K}) \setminus \overline{\mathbb{Q}}[\log(1+z), (1+z)^{\alpha} | \alpha \in \overline{\mathbb{Q}}]$. We denote $\mathcal{M}(g)$ by f. Remark that, since $g \in \mathcal{B}_{p,K}$, we can define $f_p(\alpha)$ for $\alpha \in V_p$ (cf. Remark 2.13). For a positive real number ϵ and any natural number n, we fix an n-th Padé approximation of f

$$(P_{1,\epsilon}^{(n)}(z), P_{0,\epsilon}^{(n)}(z)) \in K[z]^2 \setminus \{(0,0)\}$$

satisfying $P_{1,\epsilon}^{(n)}(z) = \sum_{j=0}^{n} p_{j,\epsilon}^{(n)} \dfrac{z(z+1)\dots(z+j-1)}{j!}$ for $\{p_{j,\epsilon}^{(n)}\}_{0 \leq j \leq n} \subset \mathcal{O}_K$ satisfying the inequality:

$$\overline{|p_{j,\epsilon}^{(n)}|} \leq \begin{cases} e^{o(n)} 2^{3n} (C_1 C_2^{(1+\epsilon)})^{(m+1)n} & \text{if } C_1 > \frac{1}{2}, \\ e^{o(n)} 2^{n} C_2^{(1+\epsilon)(m+1)n} & \text{if } C_1 \leq \frac{1}{2}, \end{cases}$$

(cf. Corollary 4.4).

Note that there are infinitely many $n \in \mathbb{N}$ satisfying

$$\det \begin{pmatrix} P_{0,\epsilon}^{(n-1)}(\alpha) & P_{1,\epsilon}^{(n-1)}(\alpha) \\ P_{0,\epsilon}^{(n)}(\alpha) & P_{1,\epsilon}^{(n)}(\alpha) \end{pmatrix} \in \overline{\mathbb{Q}}^*,$$

(cf. Corollary 5.8).

We put $D_n := D_n(\alpha) := d_n e_n \mathrm{den}(\alpha)^n \prod_{q:\mathrm{prime}, q | \mathrm{den}(\alpha)} q^{\left[\frac{n}{q-1}\right]} \in \mathbb{N}$. Then from Lemma 4.5, we have

$$D_n P_{0,\epsilon}^{(n)}(\alpha), D_n P_{1,\epsilon}^{(n)}(\alpha), D_n P_{0,\epsilon}^{(n-1)}(\alpha), D_n P_{1,\epsilon}^{(n-1)}(\alpha) \in \mathbb{Z}.$$

We put

$$A^{(n)}_{0,0,\epsilon} := D_n P^{(n-1)}_{0,\epsilon}(\alpha),\ A^{(n)}_{0,1,\epsilon} := D_n P^{(n-1)}_{1,\epsilon}(\alpha),$$
$$A^{(n)}_{1,0,\epsilon} := D_n P^{(n)}_{0,\epsilon}(\alpha),\ A^{(n)}_{1,1,\epsilon} := D_n P^{(n)}_{1,\epsilon}(\alpha),$$
$$L^{(n)}_{0,\epsilon}(X_0, X_1) := A^{(n)}_{0,0,\epsilon} X_0 + A^{(n)}_{0,1,\epsilon} X_1,\ L^{(n)}_{1,\epsilon}(X_0, X_1) := A^{(n)}_{1,0,\epsilon} X_0 + A^{(n)}_{1,1,\epsilon} X_1.$$

From the definition of D_n, we have

$$D_n \leq e^{o(n)} \left[(eC_2)^{(1+\epsilon)} \mathrm{den}(\alpha) \prod_{q:\mathrm{prime}, q|\mathrm{den}(\alpha)} q^{\frac{1}{q-1}} \right]^n. \tag{53}$$

Using Lemma 4.6, we have

$$\max_{0\leq v\leq 1} \{\overline{|P^{(n-1)}_{v,\epsilon}(\alpha)|}, \overline{|P^{(n)}_{v,\epsilon}(\alpha)|}\} \leq \begin{cases} e^{o(n)} 2^{(m+3)n} C_1^{(m+2)n} C_2^{(1+\epsilon)(m+1)n} & \text{if } C_1 > 1, \\ e^{o(n)} 2^{(m+3)n} (C_1 C_2^{1+\epsilon})^{(m+1)n} & \text{if } \frac{1}{2} < C_1 \leq 1, \\ e^{o(n)} 4^n C_2^{(1+\epsilon)(m+1)n} & \text{if } C_1 \leq \frac{1}{2}. \end{cases} \tag{54}$$

From inequalities (53) and (54), we obtain

$$\max_{0\leq v,w\leq 1} \overline{|A^{(n)}_{v,w,\epsilon}|} \leq \begin{cases} e^{o(n)} \left[2^4 e^{(1+\epsilon)} \mathrm{den}(\alpha) \prod_{q:\mathrm{prime}, q|\mathrm{den}(\alpha)} q^{\frac{1}{q-1}} C_1^3 C_2^{3(1+\epsilon)} \right]^n & \text{if } C_1 > 1, \\ e^{o(n)} \left[2^4 e^{(1+\epsilon)} \mathrm{den}(\alpha) \prod_{q:\mathrm{prime}, q|\mathrm{den}(\alpha)} q^{\frac{1}{q-1}} C_1^2 C_2^{1+\epsilon})^3 \right]^n & \text{if } \frac{1}{2} < C_1 \leq 1, \\ e^{o(n)} \left[e^{(1+\epsilon)} \mathrm{den}(\alpha) \prod_{q:\mathrm{prime}, q|\mathrm{den}(\alpha)} q^{\frac{1}{q-1}} 4 C_2^{(1+\epsilon)3} \right]^n & \text{if } C_1 \leq \frac{1}{2}. \end{cases} \tag{55}$$

Using Lemma 4.7, we have the following inequalities:

$$\begin{aligned} \max\{|L^{(n)}_{0,\epsilon}(1, f_p(\alpha))|_p, |L^{(n)}_{1,\epsilon}(1, f_p(\alpha))|_p\} &\leq e^{o(n)} |D_n|_p \left((r^{-1} + o(1)) p^{-\frac{1}{p-1}} |\alpha|_p^{-1} \right)^n \\ &\leq e^{o(n)} \left((r^{-1} + o(1)) p^{\frac{-2}{p-1}} |\alpha|_p^{-2} \right)^n. \end{aligned} \tag{56}$$

Note that we can take ϵ arbitrarily small and use Lemma 2.1 for $L^{(n)}_{0,\epsilon}(X_0, X_1)$ and $L^{(n)}_{1,\epsilon}(X_0, X_1)$ (cf. inequalities (55) and (56)), we obtain Theorem 1.2. This completes the proof of Theorem 1.2. □

Using Theorem 1.2, we obtain the following corollary.

COROLLARY 6.1. *Let p be a prime number and $g \in (\mathbf{G}(\mathbb{Q}, C_1, C_2) \cap \mathcal{B}_{p,\mathbb{Q}}) \setminus \overline{\mathbb{Q}}[\log(1+z), (1+z)^\alpha | \alpha \in \overline{\mathbb{Q}}]$. Put $r := r_p(g)$. Let $l \in \mathbb{N}$ be a natural number and $\alpha = p^{-l}$. Then we have the following statements:*

(i) *Suppose*

$$C_1 > 1 \text{ and } r p^{l+\frac{1}{p-1}} > 2^4 e (C_1 C_2)^3,$$

then we have $\mathcal{M}(g)_p(\alpha) \in \mathbb{Q}_p \setminus \mathbb{Q}$.

(ii) *Suppose*

$$\frac{1}{2} < C_1 \leq 1 \text{ and } r p^{l+\frac{1}{p-1}} > 2^4 e C_1^2 C_2^3,$$

then we have $\mathcal{M}(g)_p(\alpha) \in \mathbb{Q}_p \setminus \mathbb{Q}$.

(iii) *Suppose*

$$C_1 \leq \frac{1}{2} \text{ and } r p^{l+\frac{1}{p-1}} > 4 e C_2^3,$$

then we have $\mathcal{M}(g)_p(\alpha) \in \mathbb{Q}_p \setminus \mathbb{Q}$.

7 Some example of Theorem 1.2

In this section, we give some examples of Corollary 6.1.

EXAMPLE 7.1. m be a non-negative integer. For any prime number p, we have

$$\frac{\log^{m+1}(1+z)}{z} \in (\mathbf{G}(\mathbb{Q}, 1, e^m) \cap \mathcal{B}_{p,\mathbb{Q}}) \setminus \overline{\mathbb{Q}}[\log(1+z), (1+z)^\alpha | \alpha \in \overline{\mathbb{Q}}].$$

Note that we have $r_p\left(\frac{\log^{m+1}(1+z)}{z}\right) = 1$ and

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{M}\left(\frac{\log^{m+1}(1+z)}{z}\right) &= \left(\frac{d}{dz}\right)^m \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} B_k \left(\frac{-1}{z}\right)^{k+1} \\ &= \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} (k+1)\dots(k+m) B_k \left(\frac{-1}{z}\right)^{k+m+1},\end{aligned}$$

where $\{{B_k}^\dagger\}_{k\in\mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}}$ are defined by $\frac{z}{e^z-1} = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} B_k \frac{z^k}{k!}$.

Let l be a natural number. If p and l satisfy the condition $p^{l+\frac{1}{p-1}} > 16e^{3m+1}$, then we have $\mathcal{M}\left(\frac{\log^{m+1}(1+z)}{z}\right)_p (p^{-l}) \in \mathbb{Q}_p \setminus \mathbb{Q}$.

REMARK 7.2. In Example 7.1, Beukers gave more strong result in case of $m = 1$ by using the continued fraction of $\mathcal{M}\left(\frac{\log(1+z)}{z}\right)$ obtained by Stieltjes in [17] (cf. [6, Theorem 9.2]).

EXAMPLE 7.3. m be a non-negative integer. For prime number p which is different from 2, we have

$$\frac{2\log^m(1+z)}{1+z+\frac{1}{1+z}} \in (\mathbf{G}(\mathbb{Q}, \sqrt{2}^{-1}, \sqrt{2}e^m) \cap \mathcal{B}_{p,\mathbb{Q}}) \setminus \overline{\mathbb{Q}}[\log(1+z), (1+z)^\alpha | \alpha \in \overline{\mathbb{Q}}].$$

Note that we have $r_p\left(\frac{2\log^m(1+z)}{1+z+\frac{1}{1+z}}\right) = 1$ and

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{M}\left(\frac{2\log^m(1+z)}{1+z+\frac{1}{1+z}}\right) &= \left(\frac{d}{dz}\right)^m \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} E_k \left(\frac{-1}{z}\right)^{k+1} \\ &= \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} (k+1)\dots(k+m) E_k \left(\frac{-1}{z}\right)^{k+m+1},\end{aligned}$$

where $\{{E_k}^\ddagger\}_{k\in\mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}}$ are defined by $\frac{2}{e^z+e^{-z}} = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} E_k \frac{z^k}{k!}$.

Let l be a natural number. If p and l satisfy the condition $p^{l+\frac{1}{p-1}} > 16\sqrt{2}e^{3m+1}$, then we have $\mathcal{M}\left(\frac{2\log^m(1+z)}{1+z+\frac{1}{1+z}}\right)_p (p^{-l}) \in \mathbb{Q}_p \setminus \mathbb{Q}$.

EXAMPLE 7.4. Let m be a non-negative integer. For prime number p which is different from 2, we have

$$\frac{z\log^m(1+z)}{2+z} \in (\mathbf{G}(\mathbb{Q}, 2^{-1}, 2e^m) \cap \mathcal{B}_{p,\mathbb{Q}}) \setminus \overline{\mathbb{Q}}[\log(1+z), (1+z)^\alpha | \alpha \in \overline{\mathbb{Q}}].$$

† B_k is called the k-th Bernoulli number.

‡ E_k is called the k-th Euler number.

Note that we have $r_p\left(\frac{z\log^m(1+z)}{2+z}\right)=1$ and

$$\mathcal{M}\left(\frac{z\log^m(1+z)}{2+z}\right)=\left(\frac{d}{dz}\right)^m\sum_{k=0}^{\infty}T_k\left(\frac{-1}{z}\right)^{k+1}$$
$$=\sum_{k=0}^{\infty}(k+1)\dots(k+m)T_k\left(\frac{-1}{z}\right)^{k+m+1},$$

where $\{T_k\}_{k\in\mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}}$[§] are defined by $\frac{e^z-1}{e^z+1}=\sum_{k=0}^{\infty}T_k\frac{z^k}{k!}$.

Let l be a natural number $l\in\mathbb{N}$. If p and l satisfy the condition $p^{l+\frac{1}{p-1}}>32e^{3m+1}$, then we have $\mathcal{M}\left(\frac{z\log^m(1+z)}{2+z}\right)_p(p^{-l})\in\mathbb{Q}_p\setminus\mathbb{Q}$.

Remark 7.5. Let $g(z)\in(\mathbb{Q}[[z]]\cap\mathbb{Q}(z)[\log(1+z)])\setminus\overline{\mathbb{Q}}[\log(1+z),(1+z)^{\alpha}|\alpha\in\overline{\mathbb{Q}}]$. By definition, we have $g(z)\in(\mathbf{G}(\mathbb{Q},C_1,C_2)\cap\mathcal{B}_{p,\mathbb{Q}})\setminus\overline{\mathbb{Q}}[\log(1+z),(1+z)^{\alpha}|\alpha\in\overline{\mathbb{Q}}]$ for infinitely many prime numbers p and some $C_1,C_2>0$. In Example 7.1, 7.3 and 7.4, we give some examples of $g(z)\in(\mathbb{Q}[[z]]\cap\mathbb{Q}(z)[\log(1+z)])\setminus\overline{\mathbb{Q}}[\log(1+z),(1+z)^{\alpha}|\alpha\in\overline{\mathbb{Q}}]$ satisfying $g(z)\in(\mathbf{G}(\mathbb{Q},C_1,C_2)\cap\mathcal{B}_{p,\mathbb{Q}})\setminus\overline{\mathbb{Q}}[\log(1+z),(1+z)^{\alpha}|\alpha\in\overline{\mathbb{Q}}]$ for a prime number p and $C_1,C_2\in\mathbb{R}_{>0}$.

Example 7.6. Let m be a natural number. We denote the m-th polylogarithm function $\sum_{k=0}^{\infty}\frac{z^k}{k^m}$ by $\mathrm{Li}_m(z)$. For any prime number p, we have

$$\frac{\mathrm{Li}_m(-z)}{z}\in(\mathbf{G}(\mathbb{Q},1,e^m)\cap\mathcal{B}_{p,\mathbb{Q}})\setminus\overline{\mathbb{Q}}[\log(1+z),(1+z)^{\alpha}|\alpha\in\overline{\mathbb{Q}}].$$

Note that we have $r_p\left(\frac{\mathrm{Li}_m(-z)}{z}\right)=1$ and

$$\mathcal{M}\left(\frac{\mathrm{Li}_m(-z)}{z}\right)=-\sum_{k=0}^{\infty}C_k^{(m)}\left(\frac{1}{z}\right)^{k+1},$$

where $\{C_k^{(m)}$[¶]$\}_{k\in\mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}}$ are defined by $\frac{\mathrm{Li}_m(1-e^{-z})}{e^z-1}=\sum_{k=0}^{\infty}C_k^{(m)}\frac{z^k}{k!}$.

Let l be a natural number. If p and l satisfy the condition $p^{l+\frac{1}{p-1}}>16e^{3m+1}$, then we have $\mathcal{M}\left(\frac{\mathrm{Li}_m(-z)}{z}\right)_p(p^{-l})\in\mathbb{Q}_p\setminus\mathbb{Q}$.

References

[1] Y. Amice, *Interpolation p-adique*, Bull. Soc. Math. France, **92**, (1964), pp. 117–180.

[2] Y. Amice, *Duals*, In: Proceedings of the Conference on p-Adic Analysis (Nijmegen, 1978), Report, **7806**, Katholieke University, Nijmegen, (1978), pp. 1–15.

[3] Y. André, Séries Gevrey de type arighmétique, I. Théorémes de pureté et de dualité, Ann. Math. **151** (2000), pp. 705–740.

[§] T_k is called the k-th hyperbolic tangent number.

[¶] $C_k^{(m)}$ is called the k-th poly-Benoulli number which was defined in [4].

[4] T. Arakawa, M. Kaneko, *Multiple zeta values, poly-Bernoulli numbers, and related zeta functions*, Nagoya Mathematical Journal **153**, (1999), pp. 189–209.

[5] P. Bel, *Fonctions L p-adiques et irrationalité*, Ann. Scuola Norm. Sup. Pisa Cl. Sci. (5) Vol. **IX** (2010), pp. 189–227.

[6] F. Beukers, *Irrationality of some p-adic L-values*, Acta Math. Sin., **24**, no. 4, (2008), pp. 663–686.

[7] J. P. Bezivin, P. Robba, *A new p-adic method for proving irrationality and transcendence results*, Ann. of Math. (2) **129**, (1989), no. 1, pp. 151–160.

[8] M. Hirose, M. Kawashima, N. Sato, *A lower bound of the dimension of the vector space spanned by the special values of certain functions*, submitted.

[9] M. Kawashima, *Evaluation of the dimension of the $\mathbb{Q}$-vectors space spanned by the special values of the Lerch function*, Tukuba J. math, Vol **38**, No. 2, (2014), pp. 171-188.

[10] N. Koblitz, *p-adic Analysis: a Short Course on Recent Work*, London L.N.M., vol. **42** (1980), Cambridge Univ. Press.

[11] K. Mahler, *Zur Approximation der Exponentialfunktion und des Logarithmus I, II*, J. Reine Angew. Math., **166** (1931), p. 118–137, 138–150.

[12] K. Mahler, *Application of some formulas by Hermite to the approximation of exponentials and logarithms*, Math. Ann., **168** (1967), p. 200–227.

[13] K. Mahler, *Perfect systems*, Compositio Mathematica (1968) Volume: **19**, Issue: 2, p. 95–166

[14] E. M. Nikisin, On irrationality of the values of the functions $F(x, s)$, Math. USSR Sbornik. Vol. **37** (1980), No.3 , pp. 381–388.

[15] E. M. Nikisin, V. N. Sorokin, *Rational Approximations and Orhogonality* (*Translations of Mathematical Monographs*), American Mathematical Society, (1991).

[16] T. J. Stieltjes, *Sur quelques integrales définies et leur développement en fractions continues*, Quarterly J. Math. London, **24**, (1890), pp. 370–382.

[17] C. Siegel, *Uber einige Anwendungen diophantischer Approximationen*, Abhandlungen der Preuβischen Akademie der Wissenschaften. Physikalisch-mathematische Kalasse 1929, Nr.1.

[18] M. M. Vishik, *On applications of the Shnirel'man integral in non-archimedian analysis*, Russ Math Surv, 1979, **34**(1), pp. 247–248.

Makoto Kawashima
Mathematical Institute,
Osaka University,
Machikaneyama, Toyonaka,
Osaka, 560-8502, Japan
m-kawashima@cr.math.sci.osaka-u.ac.jp